

H. J. Res. 253. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purposes of exhibition at the Japanese Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, June 6, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

502. A letter from the Secretary, War Contracts Price Adjustment Board, transmitting the final report of the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

503. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of Public Law 6 enacted by the First Guam Legislature, pursuant to section 19 of Public Law 630, Eighty-first Congress, the Organic Act for Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

504. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of certain resolutions adopted by the Legislature of Hawaii during its recent session; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BATES of Kentucky: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4329. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 539). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee of conference. S. 872. An act to furnish emergency food aid to India; without amendment (Rept. No. 540). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 4329. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 4330. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 4331. A bill to abolish the action for alienation of affections in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 4332. A bill to authorize the city of Burlington, Iowa, to own, maintain, and

operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near said city to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 4333. A bill to modify and extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post-office purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 4334. A bill to authorize the renewal at increased rates of existing contracts for mail-messenger service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 4335. A bill to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter), cheese, and rice and rice products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 4336. A bill to provide additional compensation on account of dependents for veterans with a service-connected loss or loss of use of a foot, or blindness of one eye; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4337. A bill to authorize certain easement, land, and other property transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 4338. A bill to extend the time for completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Delaware River near Wilmington, Del.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 4339. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain educational benefits not used by veterans of World War II to the children of such veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Senate Joint Resolutions Nos. 23 and 31, relating to the National Forest Highway system in California, and to declare Napa County, State of California, a critical defense area for the purpose of obtaining financing of construction; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 4340. A bill for the relief of Cecilia Lucy Boyack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 4341. A bill for the relief of William Henry Dunn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 4342. A bill for the relief of Calcagni & Belkin, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 4343. A bill for the relief of Erika Bammes (Patricia Ann Cox); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 4344. A bill for the relief of Clyde R. Sharp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

307. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Wisconsin division of the Travelers Protective Association of America to petition Congress to withhold approval of any gasoline-tax increase, since members of this organization depend heavily upon automobile transportation in earning their livelihood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

308. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Municipal Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada, Chicago, Ill., relative to bonds and the taxation thereon and requesting rejection of the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 6, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. McCORMACK.

Dr. Edward Gardiner Latch, minister, Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Heavenly Father, who art the creator and preserver of all mankind, without whose benediction all our labor is in vain, we pray that our lives may be built not upon shifting sands but upon the rock of eternal truth. Deepen within us the love of truth and goodness. Enable us to discern the meaning of these days through which we are passing. In the midst of them keep us from stumbling and grant unto us the spirit that will help us to accept all our duties, do all our work, and meet all our trials with a cheerful courage, a sound mind, and a loving heart.

Lead us day by day into the ministry of understanding and sympathy that we as leaders of our beloved country may carry our share of the burden of the world's need. May Thy grace sustain us all our days, for in Thee alone is our hope, our strength, and our peace. We pray in the spirit of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 40 minutes on Monday next, following the disposition of the legislative program for the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 69]

Angell	Gary	Moulder
Baker	Gillette	Murray, Wis.
Barden	Gore	Nelson
Bates, Mass.	Green	O'Konski
Berry	Gregory	Patten
Blatnik	Gwinn	Patterson
Boggs, La.	Hall	Pickett
Bonner	Leonard W.	Poage
Boykin	Halleck	Poulson
Brownson	Harrison, Wyo.	Powell
Byrne, N. Y.	Hébert	Price
Carnahan	Herter	Prouty
Celler	Hoffman, Ill.	Rabaut
Chudoff	Hoffman, Mich.	Ramsay
Clemente	Hollfield	Reed, Ill.
Cooley	Irving	Regan
Coudert	Jones, Ala.	Rivers
Cox	Kearns	Roosevelt
Crawford	Kelley, Pa.	Sabath
Crosser	Kelly, N. Y.	Scott, Hardie
Davis, Tenn.	Kennedy	Scudder
Dawson	Kilburn	Shafer
Delaney	Kilday	Sheehan
Dempsey	Lanham	Smith, Kans.
Dingell	Larcade	Smith, Miss.
Dondero	Latham	Stanley
Dorn	LeCompte	Taylor
Ellsworth	McCarthy	Teague
Evins	Mack, Wash.	Thornberry
Fallon	Madden	Vursell
Fernandez	Morrow	Wigglesworth
Flood	Miller, Calif.	Willis
Forand	Miller, N. Y.	Winstead
Fugate	Morano	Wood, Ga.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 331 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ALTERATION OF CERTAIN BRIDGES OVER NAVIGABLE WATERS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3764) to amend the act of June 21, 1940, relating to the alteration of certain bridges over navigable waters, so as to include highway bridges, and for other purposes, and that the bill may be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 33.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 435) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes, to make the following changes:

On page 6, line 14, of the engrossed bill, strike out the word "of", where it occurs the first time, and in lieu thereof insert the word "to."

On page 7, lines 6 and 7, strike out the words "Federal Security Administrator" and in lieu thereof insert the words "Secretary of Labor."

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentle-

man explain the purpose of the resolution?

Mr. BECKWORTH. It will be recalled, Mr. Speaker, that not many days ago we had before us a war risk insurance bill that would make it possible for the Government to help those airlines which are engaged in the transportation of people and commodities to areas where there is unusual danger existing, to obtain the proper amount or degree of insurance coverage needed.

The bill which the House passed had already passed the Senate; the committee took the Senate bill, passed it, and brought that bill to the House and the House passed the bill unanimously. It now appears that a clarifying amendment is necessary relating to the Federal Security Agency and the Department of Labor; and then it is also necessary in order to be sure that all insurance companies qualified to participate in the writing of such insurance may participate to have an amendment to the Senate concurrent resolution of which I spoke.

That briefly is a description of what we are trying to do. I may say that it was concurred in by every member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce who was present this morning to hear the discussion.

Mr. HINSHAW. Has the gentleman also cleared this with the leadership on both sides of the aisle?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I have cleared this through the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] because the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], ranking minority member on our committee, concurred in it, and I so informed the gentleman from Massachusetts.

In this connection I read the following letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, June 5, 1951.

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: This letter is in answer to your telephonic request for my views with respect to the inclusion of the following amendment in the concurrent resolution for the correction and amendment of S. 435, an act providing authority for aviation war risk insurance:

The terms "insurance company" and "insurance carrier" in 1305 (a), (b), and 1307 (d) shall include any mutual or stock insurance company, reciprocal insurance association, and any group or association authorized to do an aviation insurance business in any State of the United States.

We would interpose no objection to the inclusion of such a definition in the resolution and members of my staff have been informed by Mr. Nathan Calkins, Chief, International and Rules Division, Civil Aeronautics Board; Mr. Roy Leiffen, counsel, Associated Aviation Underwriters; and Mr. Paul Reiber, counsel for Air Transport Association of America, that no objection would be taken to the inclusion of such a definition.

If we can be of further assistance to you in this matter, please call on us.

Sincerely yours,

D. W. RENTZEL,
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to object. I hope that the bill will be agreed to by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BECKWORTH: Page 1, after line 6, insert the following: "On page 2, after line 9, of the engrossed bill insert the following:

"(d) The terms 'insurance company' and 'insurance carrier' in section 1305 (a) and (b) and in section 1307 (d) shall include any mutual or stock insurance company, reciprocal insurance association, and any group or association authorized to do an aviation insurance business in any State of the United States."

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this amendment has the approval of the committee. I think there is no question about that.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The amendment has the approval of the committee, and the Civil Aeronautics Board, and all others who have indicated an interest in the legislation from the beginning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a letter referring to the legislation be included in connection with my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. Speaker, I take the floor this morning to deplore the failure of all in authority to do anything for the relief of the American people in their fight against the high cost of living.

Ever since this Congress met in January, high prices have stayed the No. 1 problem here on the home front.

Why should only a small percentage of our population be in a position to pay for a decent living? Why should not the prices of food and other commodities be brought within easy reach of all Americans?

I thought that was why Congress set up the OPS. I thought the high-salaried officials now being selected and delegated to carry out price stabilization understood they must knock down prices or get out.

If I were told by Congress to roll back prices of food, clothing, and other necessities, you may be certain, I would

roll them back to 1939 so we would all be able to live and eat again.

As it is now, prices stay up like gas balloons in the stratosphere. Our job here is to find out why somebody does not do something about lowering them.

The recent price war in New York City proved a lot of things. It proved that direct competition brought to bear on inflated prices will bring goods the people want down to where they can have them.

It also proved that merchants and businessmen can live by letting the customer live.

Since the New York price war benefited the consuming public and showed the country how much water can be wrung out of inflated prices, Congress should tell the people we represent that its desire is to reduce the cost of living.

Let us encourage, let us foment further price wars so that the American people can live and the American system of free enterprise will be preserved.

This is the only way the United States can pay for our tremendous rearmament and preparedness program.

This is the only way the American worker, farmer, white-collar employee, and other middle- and lower-income earners will be able to pay for their food, clothing, and other necessary items of living.

Therefore, I am introducing the following resolution, which I hope will be approved soon by Congress:

A resolution to preserve the American system of free enterprise and to lower the cost of living by encouraging price wars in retail prices of food and other necessities

Whereas it has been established that recent price wars between large metropolitan dry goods stores have enabled the American consumer to buy clothing at reasonable prices; and

Whereas these price wars clearly show that profiteering, chiseling, gorging, and unfair dealing with American consumers on the part of some entrepreneurs have compelled the public to pay outrageous prices for necessities; and

Whereas the Office of Price Stabilization seems to be helpless or hesitant to roll back the cost of living for the average citizen in spite of definite instructions from Congress; and

Whereas the American people must have immediate relief from the present high cost of living; and

Whereas barefaced competition is needed among legitimate entrepreneurs to water down bulging profits and bloated prices of food and other necessary commodities; and

Whereas price wars seem to be the only method by which competition can be brought into direct play: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the desire of the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled to call upon the Nation's business and commerce to make open war upon high prices of food and other necessities in order to preserve the American system of free enterprise and to lower the exorbitant cost of living.

EMERGENCY FOOD AID TO INDIA

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 540)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That this act may be cited as the 'India Emergency Food Aid Act of 1951.'"

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Administrator for Economic Cooperation is authorized and directed to provide emergency food relief assistance to India on credit terms as provided in section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, including payment by transfer to the United States (under such terms and in such quantities as may be agreed to between the Administrator and the Government of India) of materials required by the United States as a result of deficiencies, actual or potential, in its own resources. The Administrator is directed and instructed that in his negotiations with the Government of India he shall, so far as practicable and possible, obtain for the United States the immediate and continuing transfer of substantial quantities of such materials particularly those found to be strategic and critical.

"SEC. 3. For purposes of this Act the President is authorized to utilize not in excess of \$190,000,000 during the period ending June 30, 1952, of which sum (1) not less than \$100,000,000 shall be made available immediately from funds heretofore appropriated by Public Law 759, Eighty-first Congress, for expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended; and (2) \$90,000,000 shall be available from any balance of such funds unallotted and unobligated as of June 30, 1951: *Provided*, That if such amount unallotted and unobligated is less than \$90,000,000 an amount equal to the difference shall be obtained from the issuance of notes in such amount by the Administrator for the Economic Cooperation Administration, who is hereby authorized and directed to issue such notes from time to time during fiscal years 1951 and 1952 for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to purchase such notes and, in making such purchases to use, as a public debt transaction, the proceeds of any public debt issue pursuant to the Second Liberty Loan Act as amended: *And provided further*, That \$50,000,000 reserved by the Bureau of the Budget pursuant to section 1214 of Public Law 759 of the Eighty-first Congress from funds appropriated by that Act for expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, shall not be available for purposes of this section.

"SEC. 4. (a) Funds made available for purposes of this Act shall be used only for the purchase of food grains or equivalents in the United States.

"(b) No procurement of any agricultural product within the United States for the purpose of this Act shall be made unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall find and certify that such procurement will not impair

the fulfillment of the vital needs of the United States.

"(c) The assistance provided under this Act shall be for the sole purpose of providing food grains, or equivalents, to meet the emergency need arising from the extraordinary sequence of flood, drought, and other conditions existing in India in 1950.

"(d) The assistance provided under this Act shall be provided under the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, applicable to and consistent with the purposes of this Act.

"SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, to the extent that the President, after consultation with appropriate Government officials and representatives of private shipping, finds and proclaims that private shipping is not available on reasonable terms and conditions for transportation of supplies made available under this Act, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate \$20,000,000 to the Department of Commerce, in such manner, at such times, and in such amounts as the President shall determine, for activation and operation of vessels for such transportation, and these advances may be placed in any funds or accounts available for such purposes, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for these purposes: *Provided*, That pursuant to agreements made between the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Department of Commerce, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest not later than June 30, 1952, for such advances either from funds hereafter made available to the Department of Commerce for the activation and operation of vessels or, notwithstanding the provisions of any other Act, from receipts from vessel operations: *Provided further*, That pending such repayment receipts from vessel operations may be placed in such funds or accounts and used for activating and operating vessels.

"SEC. 6. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Administrator for Economic Cooperation is authorized to pay ocean freight charges from United States ports to designated ports of entry in India of relief packages and supplies under the provisions of section 117 (c) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, including the relief packages and supplies of the American Red Cross. Funds now or hereafter available during the period ending June 30, 1952, for furnishing assistance under the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, may be used to carry out the purposes of this section.

"SEC. 7. (a) Any sums payable by the Government of India, under the interest terms agreed to between the Government of the United States and the Government of India, on or before January 1, 1957 as interest on the principal of any debt incurred under this Act, and not to exceed a total of \$5,000,000, shall, when paid, be placed in a special deposit account in the Treasury of the United States, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, to remain available until expended. This account shall be available to the Department of State for the following uses:

"(1) Studies, instruction, technical training, and other educational activities in the United States and in its Territories or possessions (A) for students, professors, other academic persons, and technicians who are citizens of India, and (B) with the approval of appropriate agencies, institutions, or organizations in India, for students, professors, other academic persons, and technicians who are citizens of the United States to participate in similar activities in India, including in both cases travel expenses, tuition, sub-

sistence and other allowances and expenses incident to such activities; and

"(2) The selection, purchase, and shipment of (A) American scientific, technical, and scholarly books and books of American literature for higher educational and research institutions of India, (B) American laboratory and technical equipment for higher education and research in India, and (C) the interchange of similar materials and equipment from India for higher education and research in the United States.

"(b) Funds made available in accordance with the provisions stated above may be used to defray costs of administering the program authorized herein.

"(c) Disbursements from the special deposit account shall be made by the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury Department, upon vouchers duly certified by the Secretary of State or by authorized certifying officers of the Department of State."

And the House agree to the same,

JAMES P. RICHARDS,

A. A. RIBICOFF,

BROOKS HAYS,

JOHN M. VOYTS,

LAWRENCE H. SMITH,

Managers on the Part of the House.

GUY M. GILLETTE,

BRIEN MCMAHON,

J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,

ALEXANDER WILEY,

H. ALEXANDER SMITH,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the committee of conference and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The House struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The committee of conference has agreed to a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. Except for the differences noted below and except for clarifying, clerical, and necessary conforming changes, the conference substitute is the same as the House version.

The short title of the bill: In the Senate bill the short title is "India Emergency Food Aid Act of 1951." The short title in the House amendment is "India Emergency Assistance Act of 1951." The conference agreement uses the Senate language. The difference is small. The committee of conference adopted the Senate language because "food aid" more precisely describes the substance of the bill than does "assistance." It is true that the bill makes assistance available to India, but the type of assistance is "food aid."

Method of financing the loan: Both the Senate bill and the House amendment provide for a loan. The difference is on how funds should be made available. The House amendment provides for a completely "self-generating" public-debt transaction. The principal points of the Senate bill are:

(a) The loan funds (\$190,000,000) are to be provided as nearly as possible from presently available ECA appropriations. At least \$100,000,000 will be taken out of ECA funds for this purpose. The remaining \$90,000,000 will also come from ECA funds, if they are available as of June 30, 1951. Any amount short of \$90,000,000 will be provided by "self-generating" public-debt transaction of the type provided in the House amendment.

(b) The second proviso, excepting \$50,000,000 from availability for loan purposes covers a technical point. The General Appropriation Act (Public Law 759, 81st Cong.) required the President to reduce appropri-

tions by \$550,000,000 through an apportionment procedure. In accordance with this procedure, the Bureau of the Budget has withheld \$50,000,000 of ECA's funds. So far as Congress is concerned, these funds are available to ECA, having been appropriated to the President for this purpose. So far as ECA is concerned, the funds are not available, having been withheld by the Bureau of the Budget in accordance with the discretion provided in the appropriation act. ECA's estimates of availability of funds do not include the \$50,000,000 withheld. The purpose of the proviso is to specify that the withheld funds are not available for purposes of a loan to India.

The House receded and agreed to the Senate method of financing the loan. The use of appropriated funds for loan purposes is well established. Since ECA now has at least \$100,000,000 available and will by June 30, 1951, possibly have more funds available, the committee of conference felt that funds already appropriated should be utilized before additional sums are added to the public debt. The conference agreement does this.

Restriction on purpose of the assistance: There are two differences here, both of them minor. One relates to what shall be provided and the other to the causes of the crisis in India that gave rise to the need for assistance.

On the question of what is provided, the Senate bill uses the words "providing food grains, or equivalents," while the House amendment uses the words "providing food." The conference agreement contains the Senate language. India's need is for food grains or commodities serving the same purpose. The Senate language more precisely describes what India will purchase with the proceeds of the loan. The use of the words "or equivalents" is important. It may not be possible to furnish food grains in the amounts India may desire. The executive branch has informed the Congress that dried beans, flour, and other like commodities may be furnished in lieu of some food grains.

The conference agreement uses the Senate language describing the causes of the Indian food crisis. It is difficult to be precise in ascribing the causes of a food shortage of the magnitude that faces India. Limiting relief to needs caused by "natural disasters" might involve an impossible administrative problem.

Certification of availability of supplies: Both the Senate bill and the House amendment require the Secretary of Agriculture to certify that procurement for purposes of this act will not impair the vital needs of the United States. The difference is in emphasis. The Senate language provides "no procurement . . . unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall find and certify . . ." The House amendment provides "that with respect to the procurement . . . the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify . . ."

The committee of conference adopted the Senate language. The basic assumption upon which this bill rests is that the United States will provide food aid so far as aid is available without impairing the vital needs of the United States. In view of recent crop reports, United States supplies will not be as plentiful as originally indicated. United States commitments have not diminished. For these reasons, the committee of conference desired to make the responsibility of the Secretary of Agriculture quite clear. The Senate language does this.

Determining the availability of private shipping: The House amendment uses only the words "the President finds." The Senate bill uses the words "the President, after consultation with appropriate government officials and representatives of private shipping, finds and proclaims." The language of the

Senate bill is designed to make sure that Government-owned ships will not be put into service unless private shipping is unavailable on reasonable terms and conditions. Ordinarily, the procedure to determine this point involves a formal hearing and determination by the executive branch that private shipping is unavailable. This is a time-consuming procedure and would require about a month. The effect would undoubtedly be to delay shipment of grain to India. All of the evidence now indicates that private shipping is in fact unavailable. However, the committee of conference felt that sufficient provision should be made to prevent precipitate action by the executive branch without careful examination of the facts. In the interest of getting grain to India as soon as possible, the committee of conference interprets this provision to mean that no formal hearing is required, but that any executive decision that private shipping is unavailable be based on sufficient consultations to ascertain the facts of the situation.

Shipment of grain cargoes in United States flag vessels: Both the Senate bill and the House amendment provide that 50 percent of commodities furnished to India be moved in United States flag vessels. The Senate bill provides this by incorporating the applicable provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, one of which is section 111 (a) (2). This section requires the Administrator for Economic Cooperation to take steps to "assure as far as is practicable" that 50 percent of the gross tonnage be moved in United States flag vessels "to the extent that such vessels are available at market rates for United States flag vessels." The House amendment provides that no materials made available under this act can be transported from the United States unless at least 50 percent are moved in American flag vessels. In view of the shortage of shipping and the apparent necessity to put into service additional United States Government-owned vessels, the committee of conference believes that flexibility is desirable so far as possible. The settled policy of the United States on this point is expressed in the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended. These provisions have proved satisfactory for 3 years. The committee of conference believes that the India grain shipment program should be conducted under this basic policy rather than under a different policy which would be the case under the language of the House amendment.

There is an additional point in the Senate language. Provisions other than section 111 (a) (2) may be applicable to a loan transaction. It is not necessary to detail these here. This is a question for the Administrator to determine; and, in the determination, the fact that this bill is a loan will be the first test of applicability.

Use of interest payments for special purposes: The Senate bill contained the "Mundt amendment," setting aside in a special Treasury deposit account the amounts of any interest payments made by India on or before January 1, 1957, this fund to be used for a cultural interchange program for the benefit of American institutions engaged in a variety of educational, medical, and philanthropic activities in India, for the interchange of Indian and American students, professors, and technicians, and for the interchange of scholarly books and technical equipment between the two countries. This provided an arrangement similar in purpose to the use made of the Boxer indemnity fund and the use now being made of loan payments by Finland. Similar provisions were in an amendment offered by Mr. Bray in the House. However, a point of order against this amendment was sustained. The committee of conference agreed on a substitute.

The principal differences between the substitute and the Senate language are three.

The sum made available under the Senate bill might have amounted to about \$23,000,000 if 2½-percent interest on the full amount were negotiated for the period to January 1, 1957. On the other hand, no interest at all might be negotiated for that period. The committee of conference agreed on a limit for this purpose of not to exceed \$5,000,000. The conference agreement eliminates subsection (a) of the "Mundt amendment," authorizing allocations to certain American institutions in India. The conference agreement contains language providing for administrative expenses of the cultural program to be taken out of the fund and provisions regarding disbursement and accountability. These were not in the Senate bill.

Unlike the Boxer indemnity and the Finnish-loan repayment, no loan has yet been negotiated with India. The sums India may borrow and the terms of repayment will be a matter of future agreement between this country and India. The committee of conference had no data upon which to determine any formula for estimating interest payments. The committee of conference therefore agreed upon a token program from possible interest payments not to exceed \$5,000,000.

The committee of conference was aware of the needs of India for a program in the field of agriculture that would prevent a recurrence of famines. It also considered India's development programs. Further consideration of India's long- and short-term programs will be studied later this year under the technical assistance program. Similarly a well balanced mutual aid program for this region will be the subject of intensive congressional interest.

In view of the uncertainty as to any available funds from interest payments, and the lack of information as to specific programs, the committee of conference decided that only a token should be authorized at this time.

JAMES P. RICHARDS,
A. A. RUBINOFF,
BROOKS HAYS,
JOHN M. VORYS,
LAWRENCE H. SMITH,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report is a unanimous one. We think the House has won a victory in the conference agreement.

The four major points of difference between the Senate bill and the House amendment were these: The method of financing the loan, the repayment in specifically named strategic materials, the use of funds for the purchase of grains only in the United States, and the so-called Mundt amendment. The Mundt amendment provided for the use of the interest payments for an educational interchange program between the United States and India.

So far as financing the program is concerned, under the conference agreement, at least \$100,000,000 of the loan funds will come from funds already appropriated to ECA. As much of the remaining \$90,000,000 will come from such ECA funds as are unallocated or unobligated and available as of June 30, 1951. If the amount available as of June 30, 1951, is less than \$90,000,000, the balance will be raised by a self-generating public-debt transaction. The House conferees thought the Senate provision would be better, and we receded.

On the question of repayment in strategic materials and the question of specifying in the law certain strategic materials, I should like to emphasize that the provisions of the conference agreement are those of the House amendment. The Senate accepted the House language—and this includes the requirement of repayment originally in the bill reported to the House, and the Halleck amendment adopted in the House. The Senate provisions specifying manganese and monazite are not in the conference agreement.

The conference agreement contains the House provision that loan funds shall be used only for the purchase of food grains in the United States. Members will recall that this provision was put in the bill during debate in the House. The Senate receded on this point.

As far as the Mundt amendment was concerned, the Senate receded from its position and the House accepted an amendment. Assuming a loan for the full amount of \$190,000,000, an interest rate of 2½ percent, and interest payments beginning on July 1, 1952, the funds available for this program could amount to \$23,000,000 under the terms of the Mundt amendment. In fact, it is possible that there may be no interest payments by January 1, 1957, and there may be no money for this part of the program. The House conferees took the position that it was neither proper nor practicable to have any such provisions in this bill, and the House had not acted on similar provisions which were ruled out on a point of order when the matter came up here. The House conferees agreed to accept the Senate provisions with other modifications and a ceiling of \$5,000,000 on this program.

Those are the principal points of disagreement. There were 10 other small points of disagreement, mostly in regard to phraseology. Resolution of these differences was largely a perfecting process. The House receded on 5 of those 10 points and the Senate receded on the other 5 points.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, at long last we are going to do what India asked us to do nearly 6 months ago, and that is, authorize a food loan on special and easy terms. We have required that payment shall include transfer of strategic materials, and India has agreed to that. Prime Minister Nehru said in his Parliament, referring to our House bill, "We shall gladly supply such materials as are available in India and can be spared by us." He said, "We prefer the terms in the House bill." Those terms are in the bill before you now. The conferees decided that any attempt to specify the types and amounts of such materials in advance would probably be offensive, and almost certainly ineffective.

There has been a lot of criticism of Indian spokesmen in the last few months and I have joined in some of that criticism, but let us remember that there has been a good bit of delay since this food proposal was originally made. This delay has materially aroused suspicion and

criticism of our intentions, and of the good will or good faith of some of our own spokesmen. The delay has been caused by discussion and disputes about gifts that India did not ask for, with strings tied to them that India did not want. However, we come to the end of the story here today, with the differences between the two bills, which were extremely slight, fairly settled in our conference report.

The Senate bill provided for taking unspent funds from ECA to finance part of the loan when it is negotiated. That was agreeable to the House, both bodies understanding that it is money we are talking about, and that so long as we are on an unbalanced budget it is all going to be added to the national debt anyhow.

Both bodies agreed on the amendment to pay ocean freight for charitable, voluntary relief gifts to India by individuals and private organizations.

The Senate bill contained the Mundt amendment. A similar amendment was offered in the House by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY]. The conferees brought back this provision in a limited form. I have doubted the wisdom of attempting to spend interest that had not yet been agreed upon, from a loan that had not yet been negotiated, but the majority of the conferees and no doubt a majority in possibly both Houses felt that this was a token of good will toward India, this provision for an educational exchange, out of such interest as might be agreed upon for the first 5 years, up to \$5,000,000.

The conference report states, however, that we recognize the importance to India of a long-time program of agricultural improvement to eliminate the possibility of recurrent famine.

We recognize the importance of India's development plan. Hearings on these matters can come up later this year on point 4 and mutual-aid legislation. This food loan is not the last matter that will ever come up between India and the United States; if the world goes well it is the first of many negotiations, and we hope it may be concluded promptly in good form in a way that will encourage future friendship and cooperation between our countries.

I want to remind the House this bill is a bipartisan proposition. The leadership of the House has been unswerving in its support of this loan bill ever since it was introduced. I want to commend our new chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]. This is the first bill of a controversial nature which he has brought to the floor of the House. The bill was introduced before the death of our late honored colleague, Chairman Judge Kee, and of course, before the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] became chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. But in his conduct on this bill in committee and on the floor and in conference he has been eminently wise and fair, and has again proven to us, who know him closely, what you are all going to find out when you know him better, and that is that he is a man of great independence, a man of great wisdom, and a man

who is square and full of courage and common sense. He has a hard task ahead of him and I know he will fulfill that task with ability and with great patriotism.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. I have asked the gentleman to yield to me to comment briefly on what he has just said. I think the Congress and the country is to be commended upon the ascension of our distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], to the position of chairman of this very important and very highly controversial committee of the House of Representatives. I join with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio in the hope and belief that our friend will make an outstanding contribution to the cause of world peace, a thing which we all desire.

Specifically I want to comment upon the fact further that the gentleman from South Carolina will be found exercising his own judgment to a degree which will meet with the approbation on many occasions, I am sure, of the House of Representatives.

Now, so far as the India wheat bill is concerned, the changes that have been made with reference to strategic materials in the conference have amounted to the withdrawal of certain safeguards which were in the Senate bill which provided for getting these strategic materials. The Senate bill made that aspect of the bill mandatory and now you make it optional; is that not correct?

Mr. VORYS. The strategic materials requirement which did not specify particular materials was adopted by the House after it had heard from six members of the Atomic Energy Committee. It was promptly accepted by the other body. Both what those six members said on the floor of the House and the explanations that they made to the membership off the floor were sufficient to make it clear that this was the wisest and most foresighted way in which to enter the negotiations which would involve the acquisition of strategic materials.

Mr. COLMER. My distinguished friend is exercising that part of his attributes and accomplishments that he usually does so well—he answers my question with an evasive argument that makes his point a little more solid.

Mr. VORYS. No, it is not evasive and it is not unclear to anybody who understands the full import of what I have said and what the Members of the House who are familiar with our strategic materials requirements have said. It would not be in the public interest to debate this further with the gentleman at this time.

Mr. COLMER. I appreciate the gentleman's curt dismissal of my thoughts. I admit I am not as well versed in the matter as he is, but at the same time as a Member of this body, who is concerned about the future of this country and at least concerned with getting a partial repayment of these funds, I still am entitled to my own opinion about this matter, but I am not going to discuss it any further with the gentleman.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. VORYS. I want to say something about this idea of having a loan. There are those who say, "Oh, well, if you make a loan it is no good anyhow." For 10 years this Congress and this country has gone along on the idea that there is something bad about the silly dollar sign, and that we should not make loans, because we make enemies; somebody might call us "Uncle Shylock"; not when the time came to pay, but when the time came that they did not want to pay. So we have been making a lot of grants in the last 10 years. As a matter of fact, in the last 10 years we have made Government loans and grants of \$80,000,000,000, of which \$13,000,000,000 have been paid back. In the past 5 post-war years we have made \$59,000,000,000 of grants and loans, of which \$3,000,000,000 have been paid back. Thus, in 10 years our Government has put up \$67,000,000,000, net, to finance \$109,000,000,000 in exports. We have learned two things in this decade. One is that you do not buy friends with grants or gifts any more than you do with loans. Another thing we have learned is that in the \$109,000,000,000 of goods we have exported we have been pouring out our permanent treasure, our natural resources and that we are becoming a "have not" nation in many strategic materials. We are already importing iron ore, we import copper, petroleum, and a long and growing list of strategic materials. A country that needs imports ought to make loans for repayment through the future.

I want to call the attention of this House, as we conclude our action on this important bill, to the fact that we must be thinking more and more, in the program that lies before us, in order to protect our own security in the future, of making loans instead of always making grants.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman will recall that he and other members of the committee, and probably all Members of Congress, have received many letters on this issue which said that the United States Congress must not put any political strings in the legislation that would require the Indian Government to tie its foreign policy to ours, or side with us on various international questions, and all that sort of thing. Is it not a fact that there never was any suggestion within our committee from any member of it, of the Congress, or from anyone in the executive branch that this loan should be accompanied by any political strings whatsoever as far as India's foreign policy is concerned?

Mr. VORYS. That is true. Certainly the proposition that comes before you today is devoid of any political strings that could force India's foreign policy to coincide with ours.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. In section 2 discretion is put in the Administrator to determine as far as possible what the United States

shall obtain in the way of strategic materials. That is a wide discretion placed in the Administrator to determine particularly those things found to be strategic and critical, is it not? The Administrator determines what are strategic and critical materials, according to this act?

Mr. VORYS. Certainly that is true. The list of strategic materials we need is well known, but it is not in the bill. As to the way the negotiations shall take place, the Administrator and his five advisers on the National Advisory Council will not have their hands tied. If India needs this grain, this loan will be negotiated and its terms known in a short while. The Congress has been on the spot on this issue for months and months. When this legislation is passed the ECA Administrator and his advisers—including the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson; the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sawyer; the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder; the head of the Federal Reserve bank, Mr. Martin; and the head of the Export-Import Bank, Mr. Gaston—are going to be on the spot to see that they carry out the spirit as well as the letter of this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I do not think any of us are opposed to the use of the four-letter word "loan," but experience has taught us in the past that it is simply a subterfuge. The gentleman says we ought to be dealing more in terms of loans. What information does the gentleman have that if we do start using loans instead of grants-in-aid, and so forth, what evidence does the gentleman have that they are going to pay these loans back? Is their capacity to repay them any better than it was a few years ago?

Mr. VORYS. Certain countries have more capacity. The world in general has more capacity. India has the capacity to repay. Ex-President Hoover, when he was before our committee in 1947, suggested that we use the loan formula, or at least always create an obligation on the other countries in foreign-aid transactions, so as not to get them into the psychology of relievers. We know about the relief psychology here during WPA days. He said, "If you require loans, each country will try to show up in as good shape as possible, and will ask as little as possible, but if you provide gifts, the country tries to show how needy it is and tries to get as much as possible."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman go so far as to say that the taxpayers of the United States who must carry this burden are getting a mighty good deal out of this; that this is something that should be approved, because we are going to be ahead in the end; that we will get our money back and a lot of strategic materials? In fact,

we are driving a sharp bargain with India. Do you think the Members could make a statement like that to the people?

Mr. VORYS. No.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Would you say that or would you say that it was a pretty poor bill, as a banker, and that we will not get our money back and we might as well forget about it? Or are we some place in between?

Mr. VORYS. That is right; some place in between.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What is it?

Mr. VORYS. I am going to answer.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I would like to have the gentleman's answer.

Mr. VORYS. This is not a case of driving a hard bargain with India whose people are starving; on the other hand, this, in my judgment, is not an example of open-handed giving away of the people's substance; this is authorizing a loan between two sovereign, independent nations, which we hope will result in the future to the mutual advantage of both, not only in what we will receive but in what India will receive.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am afraid my people would not be satisfied with that answer.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. May I say in answer to the question asked by the gentleman from Nebraska that there are very few countries in the world today that are as good risks as India. I think this loan provision is a good compromise. There was a great deal of sentiment throughout the country amongst the people for extending this aid on a grant basis, on the basis of humanitarianism; nevertheless, compromise has been made for a loan, and I as one of those who was active in this thing initially am satisfied that the conferees have done a splendid job, and I believe a majority of the Members of the House will be similarly satisfied with what is distinctly a compromise between two points of view.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I wanted to join in that statement because there have been men here who did pursue a sound course—I am referring to the gentleman from Ohio—in insisting upon the loan procedure for the bulk of this assistance. I understand something about the philosophy of those who think there should be a beneficial grant. But does not the gentleman agree that we have gone about as far as we are justified in going through the giving of aid by the American Red Cross, through CARE, and such organizations in providing ocean freight at Government expense for food to be given away to those in India who cannot buy it?

Mr. VORYS. I certainly think that the amendment which the gentleman offered here—and a similar amendment was adopted in the Senate—goes about as far as we can go in implementing the charitable instincts of our people. I feel that the Congress itself has no right to attempt to be charitable with other people's money and give it away to foreign-

ers where there is no quid pro quo. On the other hand, charity is the greatest virtue in the world, and when our people feel that way and our organizations do and they have made gifts, the Government can then, under the gentleman's amendment, come in and help pay the freight so that the gifts will go as far as possible and reduce the need for Government relief. I congratulate the gentleman on offering his amendment.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his kind words. I wanted to bring out the point with as much emphasis as it is possible, that we do expect this loan to be repaid, and there is every indication that it will be, but, of course, we cannot foresee the future.

Another point I wanted to ask the gentleman about is whether he does not have in mind that there will be some conversations with or expression to India in the matter of a long-range program toward achieving some agricultural stability so that her food system will be stabilized? Is not that to receive further study this year? Would the gentleman not want to emphasize the further expression in the report that "a well-balanced mutual-aid program for the region will be the subject of continuing congressional interest"? In other words, there has been, and it is understandable, a tendency to feel that the effort is a one-sided affair; but India has a great future, we believe, and great potentiality as a nation. We have a great stake in India's economic stability, and we will derive from that kind of sound long-range planning, in other words, helping people to help themselves, the kind of stability in the Pacific that will stabilize world conditions.

Mr. VORYS. I wrote those statements in the conference report which the gentleman quoted and am still of that opinion. I am glad my fellow conferees agreed with my statements and I thank my colleague for his interest in this long-range viewpoint.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Can the gentleman give in round figures the amount of the loan that this transaction involves?

Mr. VORYS. It cannot exceed \$190,000,000; it can be any amount up to that.

My own surmise is that in all probability the full amount will not be taken, but there is \$379,000,000 annually of production of strategic materials from which India could make periodic repayments on the loan.

Mr. JONAS. I should like to follow this question with another: If it is \$190,000,000 that is involved who carries the expense of provisioning the boats and carrying the freight across and carrying the expense of shipment? Where is that absorbed, in what department? To whom is it charged?

Mr. VORYS. The Government of India.

Mr. JONAS. The Government of India; and that is added to the \$190,000,000 loan?

Mr. VORYS. Under the provisions of this bill the Government of India pays

the freight from our shores. Under the loan provision the Government of India will buy grain from us; we provide the ships; they pay the freight.

Mr. JONAS. That is added to the \$190,000,000?

Mr. VORYS. No.

Mr. JUDD. It will be paid out of their reserves.

Mr. JONAS. That is included in the \$190,000,000?

Mr. VORYS. It comes out of the \$190,000,000 or any other money they have.

Mr. JONAS. The total then will be \$190,000,000.

Mr. VORYS. Yes. The total from us cannot exceed \$190,000,000, even though India spent more from other sources on freight.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the very kind remarks just made by my friend from Mississippi and my friend from Ohio about the present chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I would be less than human if I did not feel and express appreciation of what was said, even though I have grave doubts as to my ability to measure up to the standard set by my predecessor at the helm of this great committee. No chairman of any committee of this House has had better cooperation and more able assistance from his committee membership, Democrats and Republicans, than has the present chairman of our committee. I am fortunate, indeed, that I have sitting by me to guide me in the trying days ahead that great old Roman the gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. EATON, formerly our able chairman. I am fortunate, too, in enjoying the friendship and the able assistance of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], who has just spoken, a man whom I consider to be the peer of any Member of the House, or Senate, or State Department, in the field of legislation dealing with our foreign affairs. We have often agreed and sometimes disagreed on legislation, but always I have found him to be conscientious, fair, able, and, even if against you, a foeman worthy of your steel. What more could any man ask?

No doubt the Foreign Affairs Committee will in the coming months present momentous legislation to the Congress, but I assure you, knowing the entire committee membership as I do, that any measure coming here for foreign assistance—I am not talking about feeding somebody who is hungry or dying—will have been considered by our committee on a nonpartisan basis and from the standpoint of what is best for the United States and the Government we love.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the "ayes" appear to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 256, nays 82, not voting 94, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]
YEAS—256

Aandahl	Fulton	Martin, Mass.
Abbitt	Furcolo	Mills
Adair	Gamble	Mitchell
Addonizio	Garmatz	Morgan
Albert	Golden	Morris
Allen, Calif.	Goodwin	Morrison
Andersen,	Gordon	Morton
H. Carl	Gore	Multer
Anderson, Calif.	Granahan	Mumma
Anfuso	Granger	Murdock
Armstrong	Grant	Murphy
Aspinall	Greenwood	Norblad
Auchincloss	Gregory	O'Brien, Ill.
Ayres	Hagen	O'Brien, Mich.
Bailey	Hale	O'Neill
Bakewell	Hall,	Ostertag
Baring	Edwin Arthur	O'Toole
Barrett	Halleck	Patman
Bates, Ky.	Hand	Perkins
Battle	Harden	Philbin
Beamer	Hardy	Potter
Beckworth	Hart	Preston
Belcher	Harvey	Price
Bender	Havener	Priest
Bennett, Fla.	Hays, Ark.	Quinn
Berry	Hays, Ohio	Radwan
Betts	Hedrick	Rains
Blackney	Heffernan	Reams
Boggs, Del.	Heller	Rees, Kans.
Bolling	Herter	Rhodes
Bolton	Heselton	Ribicoff
Bow	Hess	Richards
Bramblett	Hill	Riehlman
Bray	Hillings	Riley
Brooks	Hinshaw	Roberts
Brown, Ga.	Hollfield	Rodino
Brown, Ohio	Holmes	Rogers, Colo.
Bryson	Hope	Rogers, Fla.
Budge	Horan	Rogers, Mass.
Burdick	Howell	Rooney
Burnside	Hunter	Sadiak
Burton	Jackson, Calif.	St. George
Butler	Jackson, Wash.	Sasser
Camp	James	Saylor
Canfield	Jarman	Scott,
Cannon	Javits	Hugh D., Jr.
Case	Jenkins	Scudder
Chatham	Johnson	Secrest
Chelf	Jones, Ala.	Seely-Brown
Chenoweth	Jones,	Shelley
Church	Hamilton C.	Sheppard
Cole, Kans.	Judd	Sikes
Combs	Karsten, Mo.	Sittler
Cooper	Kean	Smith, Miss.
Corbett	Kearney	Spence
Cotton	Keating	Springer
Crosser	Keogh	Staggers
Crumpacker	Kerr	Steed
Cunningham	Kersten, Wis.	Stigler
Curtis, Mo.	King	Tackett
Dague	Kirwan	Talle
Davis, Tenn.	Klein	Thomas
Dawson	Kluczynski	Thompson,
Deane	Lane	Mich.
DeGraffenried	Lanham	Thompson, Tex.
Denny	Lantaff	Thornberry
Denton	Lesinski	Tollefson
Devereux	Lind	Trimble
Dollinger	Lovre	Van Zandt
Dolliver	McConnell	Vaughn
Donohue	McCormack	Vinson
Donovan	McCulloch	Vorys
Doyle	McDonough	Walter
Durham	McGrath	Watts
Eaton	McGregor	Welchel
Eberharther	McGuire	Welch
Elliott	McKinnon	Wharton
Ellsworth	McMillan	Whitaker
Elston	McMullen	Wickersham
Engle	Machrowicz	Widnall
Feighan	Mack, Ill.	Wier
Fenton	Mack, Wash.	Williams, N. Y.
Fernandez	Madden	Withrow
Fine	Magee	Wolverton
Fogarty	Mahon	Yates
Ford	Mansfield	Yorty
Frazier	Marshall	Zablocki

NAYS—82

Abernethy	Andersen,	Bennett, Mich.
Allen, Ill.	August H.	Bentsen
Allen, La.	Andrews	Bishop

Brehm	Harris	Robeson
Buffett	Harrison, Va.	Rogers, Tex.
Burleson	Hoeven	Schwabe
Busbey	Hull	Scribner
Bush	Jenison	Shafer
Byrnes, Wis.	Jensen	Short
Carlyle	Jonas	Simpson, Ill.
Chipperfield	Jones,	Simpson, Pa.
Clevenger	Woodrow W.	Smith, Va.
Cole, N. Y.	Lucas	Stefan
Colmer	McVey	Sutton
Cox	Martin, Iowa	Taber
Curtis, Nebr.	Mason	Towe
Davis, Ga.	Miller, Md.	Vall
Davis, Wis.	Miller, Nebr.	Van Pelt
D'Ewart	Murray, Tenn.	Velde
Fellows	Nicholson	Vursell
Fisher	Norrell	Werdell
Forrester	O'Hara	Wheeler
Gathings	Passman	Whitten
Gavin	Pickett	Williams, Miss.
George	Rankin	Wilson, Tex.
Gossett	Redden	Wolcott
Graham	Reece, Tenn.	Wood, Idaho
Gross	Reed, N. Y.	Woodruff

NOT VOTING—94

Angell	Fugate	Nelson
Arends	Gary	O'Konski
Baker	Gillette	Patten
Barden	Green	Patterson
Bates, Mass.	Gwinn	Phillips
Beall	Hall,	Polk
Blatnik	Leonard W.	Poulsen
Boggs, La.	Harrison, Wyo.	Powell
Bonner	Hébert	Prouty
Bosone	Herlong	Rabaut
Boykin	Hoffman, Ill.	Ramsay
Breen	Hoffman, Mich.	Reed, Ill.
Brownson	Irving	Regan
Buckley	Jones, Mo.	Rivers
Byrne, N. Y.	Kearns	Roosevelt
Carnahan	Kelley, Pa.	Sabath
Celler	Kelly, N. Y.	Scott, Hardie
Chudoff	Kennedy	Sheehan
Clemente	Kilburn	Sieminski
Cooley	Kilday	Smith, Kans.
Coudert	Larcade	Smith, Wis.
Crawford	Latham	Stanley
Delaney	LeCompte	Stockman
Dempsey	Lyle	Taylor
Dingell	McCarthy	Teague
Dondero	Meador	Wigglesworth
Dorn	Morrow	Willis
Doughton	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Ind.
Evins	Miller, N. Y.	Winstead
Fallon	Morano	Wood, Ga.
Flood	Moulder	
Forand	Murray, Wis.	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Merrow for, with Mr. Winstead against.
Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Wood of Georgia against.

Mr. Clemente for, with Mr. Sheehan against.

Mr. Gary for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Byrne of New York for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois against.

Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. Gillette against.
Mr. Jones of Missouri for, with Mr. Dondero against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Smith of Kansas against.

Mr. Polk for, with Mr. Kearns against.

Mr. Forand for, with Mr. Baker against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Dorn against.

Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. Larcade against.

Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Harrison of Wyoming for, with Mr. Bonner against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Doughton against.

Mrs. Kelly of New York for, with Mr. Regan against.

Mr. Chudoff for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.

Mr. Evins for, with Mr. Teague against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Brownson.
Mr. Carnahan with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. Sieminski with Mr. Beall.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Angell.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Wigglesworth.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Green with Mr. Patterson.
Mr. Patten with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Morano.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Hardie Scott.
Mr. Fugate with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Breen with Mr. Phillips.

Mr. DENNY changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACHESON QUALIFIES UNITED STATES FOR ANANIAS CLUB—HE SHOULD RESIGN

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, it is now a matter of official record, a matter of sworn testimony, that falsehood, prevarication, deliberate deception, doctored facts and calculated misinformation—and the systematic use of these dishonest devices—are a part of the foreign policy of the United States as formulated and carried out by Secretary of State Dean Gooderham Acheson, by and with the assent of the President of the United States.

It is now a matter of official record, a matter of sworn testimony, that the executive branch of the United States Government, through the Department of State, formulates a propaganda line as expediency dictates and without regard for truthfulness or accuracy, and that it employs the public information agencies of the Government—both foreign and domestic, and including the Voice of America radio broadcasts—to disseminate that propaganda line.

It is now a matter of official record, a matter of sworn testimony, that the executive branch of the United States Government, through the agency of Secretary of State Dean Gooderham Acheson, has on occasion planned and promulgated a program of deception intended for dissemination to the potential enemies of the United States, to the friends of the United States, and to the American people.

This is all a matter of official record through the sworn testimony of Secretary of State Dean Gooderham Acheson, himself, given last week before the Senate Joint Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees.

Theodore Roosevelt created the Ananias Club, and from time to time conferred membership upon those individuals whom he wished thus politely to brand as liars.

But it has remained for Secretary of State Dean Gooderham Acheson to qualify Uncle Sam for membership in the Ananias Club.

It is most important that, in the flood of testimony currently being presented before the joint committee, the import and implication of these admissions by Secretary Acheson not be overlooked.

It is no trifling thing, even in an era and in an administration of unprecedented political cynicism, hypocrisy, and dishonesty, to have the United States of America branded before the world by its own Secretary of State as a practitioner of a propaganda line and of the diplomatic lie.

It is no trifling thing to have a supposedly responsible public official, the Secretary of State of the United States no less, acknowledge that he has cast the Government of the United States in that dishonest and dishonorable role.

All claims to moral leadership in world affairs, made in behalf of the United States and based on professed adherence to principles of truth and integrity, must stand as a sham and a mockery so long as this act and this policy remain unrepudiated, and so long as the man who admits the principal part in that deception is permitted to remain in office as Secretary of State.

The admission, reluctantly wrung from the lips of Dean Gooderham Acheson and made a matter of record over his insistent protest, ought to be the final and compelling proof of his total unfitness for the high office he holds.

Dean Acheson now stands before the world, and before his countrymen, in this hour of crisis, not only as an admitted liar but as a public official who does not scruple to make the Government of the United States a liar.

Dean Acheson has acknowledged full responsibility—as he did more than a year ago—for the State Department document of December 23, 1949, instructing information personnel and foreign representatives of the Department to disseminate facts relative to the importance of the island of Formosa to the security of the United States and to other countries opposing communism.

This document advised State Department information personnel and foreign representatives that—

Formosa, politically, geographically, and strategically, is part of China in no way especially distinguished or important.

This document instructed State Department information personnel and foreign representatives that—

If rising public interest warrants it, gradually increasing attention may be paid Formosa, to establish publicly the facts indicated below.

And listed among these facts was the following:

All material should be used best to counter the false impressions that . . . Its (Formosa's) loss would seriously damage the interests of either the United States or of other countries opposing communism.

Without evidencing undue preoccupation with the subject, emphasize as appropriate any of the following main points: . . . Formosa has no special military significance.

For domestic consumption particularly, the instructions provided:

In areas of insistent demand for United States action, particularly in the United

States itself, we should occasionally make clear that seeking United States bases on Formosa, sending in troops, supplying arms, dispatching naval units, or taking any similar action would (a) accomplish no material good for China or its Nationalist regime.

By way of further assuring that the official line of thought control would be firmly adhered to, the document instructed that information personnel and foreign representatives—

Avoid: References which would indicate important strategic significance or that the island is a political entity.

The instructions also provided for a calculated and systematic discrediting of any public sentiment which might develop in the United States counter to the policies adopted by the administration:

In reflecting United States unofficial demands for action of various kinds in Formosa, avoid giving them prominence unwarranted by their limited (usually individual) source, and make clear that the total of such demands evidences concern and frustration in some quarters but does not add up to a consensus on any particular position different from that officially taken.

The avowed purpose of these instructions, and of the actions called for thereunder, was "to formulate" an "information policy which will minimize damage to United States prestige and others' morale by the possible fall of Formosa to the Chinese Communist forces."

Although Mr. Acheson, in his testimony to the joint committees explained that "this is a directive as to the line to be taken in the event that Formosa falls, in order to minimize the damage to us," it is obvious from the excerpts cited above, and from the entire text of the document, that this propaganda line, both at home and abroad, was to be initiated forthwith—not merely after the fall of Formosa.

Mr. Acheson told the joint committees that the facts as alleged in this document—the facts which State Department personnel were ordered to disseminate at home and abroad, regardless of their own knowledge to the contrary—were patently untrue:

This is a policy information paper; this is not a statement of the United States policy toward the Far East.

Mr. Acheson now testifies under oath that in reality the official policy was:

First of all, it was understood and agreed that Formosa had strategic importance so far as the United States was concerned.

The second point was that that strategic importance related to keeping Formosa out of the hands of a power which would be hostile to the United States.

Thus before the joint committees, Mr. Acheson draws the line between the professed policy ordered for propaganda purposes when it was decided that Formosa could not be saved and the genuine policy of the administration, between the facts of the official, authorized line, and the true facts.

This sort of approach by the Government of the United States to a grave problem of foreign relations raises some interesting questions.

For instance, when the information personnel and foreign representatives of the State Department were ordered to

start lying about Formosa, were they supposed to know that they were lying and to obey cheerfully, or did Mr. Acheson and the others responsible for the instructions assume that their hired hands would believe the official propaganda line as the Gospel truth? In other words, does Mr. Acheson now admit that his hired hands were dishonest—or merely dumb? Does Mr. Acheson hold that the obligation of sworn officials of the Government of the United States—in and out of the State Department—includes the duty of participating in the promulgation to the world, including the American people, of known falsehoods and deceptions? Did Mr. Acheson and the administration so misjudge General MacArthur as to assume that he would regard announcement of an official propaganda line as making it mandatory upon him to go along with an obvious untruth and deception? Was MacArthur's dismissal the price he paid for his integrity?

The further question arises as to exactly who was to be affected by this entire program of studied deception, and to what end. Who was to be impressed by our attempted minimizing of the importance of the fall of Formosa?

Certainly it would be impossible to deceive either the Chinese Communists or Soviet Russia as to the strategic importance of the Communist victory if Red China captured Formosa.

Certainly competent military and diplomatic leadership of other friendly nations would be fully aware of the grave loss and threat to the United States and to other countries opposing communism, both in terms of security and prestige, involved in the capture of Formosa.

Certainly the people of the Orient could not fail to understand the victory thus gained by communism and the "loss of face" involved for the enemies of communism—despite anything the Voice of America might broadcast.

Certainly the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa—many of them facing the firing squad and all of them doomed to Communist bondage—would not have their understanding of the gravity of the loss minimized by America's propaganda line.

Is it not obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the professed desire of minimizing the damage could be directed toward only one object so far as any reasonable prospect of success was concerned—the deception by the administration of the American people themselves?

In other words, if the lie was told often enough and emphatically enough, and if the critics of the announced policy of abandoning Formosa could be sufficiently discredited as unofficial, individual, and insignificant, and if the military officers of the United States—including, of course, MacArthur—could be kept entirely gagged and subordinate, and if dissenting Members of Congress could be ridiculed for their views, as Senator TAFT was ridiculed by Mr. Truman's comment, "I didn't know Senator TAFT was a military expert"—why, then, perhaps the loss of Formosa could be minimized in the one place where there was a possibility of its being minimized and in the one place where it was important to the administration that it be minimized,

right here at home with the American people.

With respect to this technique of minimizing damage by saying that it has no special military significance, Secretary Acheson told the committee:

As I said yesterday, this is a common attitude in dealing with things which are disadvantageous to us.

That statement can be taken as meaning only one thing. It means that the December 23, 1949, document of deception and falsehood was not an isolated incident or an isolated offense. It means that dissemination of falsehood and deception and doctored facts and calculated misinformation, to the world and to the American people, is standard procedure, if and when the administration in general and Dean Gooderham Acheson in particular deem it expedient.

For all of his dishonesty and deceit, for all of his smoothness and supposed adroitness, for all of his capacity for double talk and evasion, Dean Gooderham Acheson could not escape the fact that publication of the December 23, 1949, document put himself and, tragically, the United States, on record before the world in this shameful light.

In his letter of May 22 to the joint committees, urging continued suppression of the text of the December 23, 1949, document, as quoted in the press, Acheson warned, with a truthfulness which for once even he could not avoid, that release of this document "would give the Russians ammunition to use to discredit the United States information program 'by arguing that the Voice of America thinks up its arguments—and, by implication, its facts—as they may be necessary to support a preconceived foreign policy.'"

It is unfortunate that Dean Gooderham Acheson apparently recognizes the embarrassing consequences of deceit only after the fact, only after he is caught in the lies.

And it is unfortunate that not merely the United States information program but—vastly more important and more tragic—the good name of the Government of the United States is discredited by this policy of deceit.

There are those who are skeptical of Mr. Acheson's current explanation of the December 23, 1949, document. The doubters cannot be criticized for their skepticism, since they are dealing with the testimony of a public official who has pleaded guilty to the promulgation of falsehoods and deception. And there seems to be some logic to justify the skepticism.

It is noteworthy that just 13 days after the distribution of this supposedly confidential document, the President issued a public statement as to American policy regarding Formosa, and Mr. Acheson elaborated on this statement in a press conference held on the President's instructions.

The Presidential statement completely disavowed any intention to aid in the defense of Formosa. It said:

The United States Government will not pursue a course which will lead to involvement in the civil conflict in China.

This, incidentally, despite the fact that in the letter of transmittal accompanying the State Department white paper of July 30, 1949, Secretary Acheson described the conflict in China as foreign domination masked behind the facade of a vast crusading movement which apparently has seemed to many Chinese to be wholly indigenous and national.

And the President's statement continued:

The United States Government will not provide military aid or advice to Chinese forces on Formosa.

It is difficult to reconcile such a public announcement, and particularly the timing of that announcement, with the current statements of Mr. Acheson that the Government at that time recognized the importance of Formosa to the security of the United States and was concerned over the effects of its possible fall.

It is difficult to reconcile this announcement to the world, including the Chinese Communists, that we would not lift a finger to save Formosa—thereby virtually inviting the Chinese Reds to move in—with the concern which Mr. Acheson now says was then felt over the possible loss of Formosa and over the need for minimizing the gravity of that loss.

Perhaps, however, Mr. Acheson is telling the truth in his current testimony before the committees.

If so, he is admitting, as I have already pointed out, that deception and falsehood are standard procedure in the administration of the foreign policy of the United States.

If, on the other hand, Mr. Acheson is lying to the committees now, if he is perjuring himself, if he is trying to alibi for the December 23, 1949, document and for the fact that he did not believe Formosa important to American security, then he is doing so by the shocking device of falsely charging that the President of the United States and the Government of the United States were parties to a systematic and calculated program of deception back in December 1949.

It is far from a reassuring situation to the American people to be faced with these alternative conclusions—the only possible alternative conclusions—with respect to the man who occupies the office of Secretary of State of the United States.

It is incomprehensible that a man who has placed himself in such a position before the American people and before the world, in this time of crisis, should not have the common decency to resign and thereby relieve the Nation and the President of the intolerable situation thereby created.

And intolerable it is, for his acknowledgment of the policy and practice of deceit destroys all possibility of hereafter reposing any confidence in Mr. Acheson or in his word or in the State Department so long as it is under his direction.

Mr. Acheson has acknowledged to the committee that the technique of falsehood and deception is "a common atti-

tude in dealing with things which are disadvantageous to us."

He has acknowledged that this technique was employed with respect to the Formosan question, even though it involved deceiving not only our potential enemies and our allies but the American people themselves.

How can there be any assurance that this technique will not be, and has not been, found useful "in dealing with things which are disadvantageous to us"—things strictly between the State Department and the American people or the Congress?

The ethics of Machiavellianism are notoriously lax.

There have been those of us in Congress who have felt that the State Department's white paper of July 30, 1949, blaming the tragic failure of American policy in China on the alleged derelictions of Chiang Kai-shek, was a well-planned alibi for State Department blunders, ineptitude, and disloyalty to American interests. There have been those of us in Congress who have pointed out the numerous crucial omissions of documents and information from that report—including omission of the vital 1944-45 Army Intelligence report which accurately interpreted and forecast the Communist peril in China. There have been those of us in Congress who have pointed out that this white paper ignored the administration failure to provide assistance voted by Congress for China when that assistance would have turned the tide in favor of the Nationalist government. How can we avoid the conclusion that the white paper reflects the "common attitude in dealing with things which are disadvantageous to us"?

Permit me to review a bit of history in connection with the tragic record of another nation which fell prey to communism, with the aid of the State Department.

On January 16, 1947, I called attention on the floor of the House to reports that Donald Hiss, a brother of Alger Hiss and an associate of Mr. Acheson's law firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb, was engaged in efforts to secure a half-billion-dollar American loan for the Communist-dominated Polish Government and that the reported fee involved would run to a million dollars.

Mr. Acheson promptly denied that he was any longer connected with the law firm and stated that since joining the Department of State he had no financial interest in the business. He had nothing to say as to the propriety of the firm's activity in that field.

Three days later, on January 19, I repeated the charges in a radio broadcast. I elaborated on them, pointing out that his name was still listed with the law firm in the phone directory, on the door of the law office, and on the building directory. I pointed out that he had not denied that his former economic adviser, Donald Hiss, left the State Department to become affiliated with the law firm. And I suggested that Mr. Acheson resign at once as Under Secretary of State.

Was Mr. Acheson's evasion of the basic questions of facts and of ethics in this situation in keeping with "the common attitude of dealing with things which are disadvantageous to us"?

In view of Mr. Acheson's acknowledged use of deceit and falsehood in the Formosan matter, can Members of Congress have confidence in any information or counsel which Mr. Acheson has given Congress in the past or may give in the future?

We still recall the question raised by Senator HICKENLOOPER during the hearings on the North Atlantic Pact:

Are we going to be expected to send substantial numbers of troops over there as a more or less permanent contribution to the development of those countries' capacity to resist?

And we still recall Mr. Acheson's reply:

The answer to that question, Senator, is a clear and absolute "No."

Now, not any of the hair-splitting explanations which Mr. Acheson offers for that categorical answer will dispel the impression that he spoke an untruth, that he did so deliberately, and that he answered in a manner calculated to deal effectively with things which were disadvantageous to the program and the objective he had in view.

In view of Mr. Acheson's current efforts, before the joint committees, to justify the unconstitutional usurpation of the authority of Congress by Mr. Truman, in putting the United States into the Korean war, and in view of his adoption of the official doctrine that "use of the congressional power to declare war has fallen into abeyance," it is interesting to note previous statements on the subject by Mr. Acheson—statements designed to deal "with things which are disadvantageous to us."

In May 1945 Congressman Louis Ludlow addressed this inquiry to Mr. Acheson:

Under (the Dumbarton Oaks proposal) what becomes of the constitutional process of declaring war by act of Congress. Is our future, as far as participation in peace or war is concerned, to be governed by Congress or by the Security Council to be set up under the new organization? Is the constitutional provision relating to the declaration of war changed or diluted by the Dumbarton Oaks proposal, and if so, how is it changed or diluted? In other words, what happens to our constitutional war-declaring provision under the new world set-up?

Here was Mr. Acheson's reply, under date of June 13, 1945:

The broad answer to your question is, I think, entirely clear. Nothing in the proposed United Nations organization is intended to or could possibly change any of our constitutional provisions in any way.

Later, in his address announcing the North Atlantic Pact, delivered March 19, 1949, Mr. Acheson gave similar categorical assurances with respect to the war-declaring authority of the Congress—assurances which are now completely repudiated by Mr. Acheson:

Article 5 deals with the possibility, which unhappily cannot be excluded, that the nations joining together in the Pact may have to face the eventuality of an armed attack. In this article, they agree that an armed at-

tack on any of them, in Europe or North America, will be considered an attack on all of them. In the event of such an attack, each of them will take, individually and in concert with the other parties, whatever action it deems necessary to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area, including the use of armed force.

This does not mean that the United States would be automatically at war, if one of the nations covered by the Pact is subjected to armed attack. Under our Constitution, the Congress alone has the power to declare war. We would be bound to take promptly the action which we deemed necessary to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area. * * * That decision will rest where the Constitution has placed it.

How vastly different are these assurances from the practice followed, with Mr. Acheson's full endorsement, in the Korean situation; how different, from the practice which Mr. Acheson warns may be followed in the case of other outbreaks of aggression; how different, from the doctrine that use of the congressional power to declare war has fallen into abeyance.

It is obvious here again that Mr. Acheson was following his Machiavellian code of ethics which holds that deceit and falsehood are a common and justifiable technique and attitude "in dealing with things which are disadvantageous to us."

True to that code, Mr. Acheson has sought unceasingly to secure more and more power for the Executive. A notorious example was the State Department draft of the first military assistance bill presented to Congress following ratification of the North Atlantic Pact. The effect of this bill was to give the President complete discretion as to the assistance, in the form of finances and arms which this country would give other nations. This provision brought a storm of protest from Republicans and Democrats alike—in Congress and out. It was promptly tossed out, but not before one Member of the Senate had indignantly charged that "it called for the virtual creation of a total world-wide war-lord power in the White House."

That was not the outcry of a narrow, partisan-minded Senator, of a habitual alarmist, of a confirmed isolationist, or of a chronic foe of the administration. That stinging indictment was voiced by the man now hailed by these same power-crazed leaders in the White House as the sainted leader of bipartisanism, the late Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg.

Today this complete control, this claim of total world-wide war-lord power by the White House, which drew the rebuke from Senator Vandenberg, is made with respect to the lives of Americans and with respect to the constitutional prerogative of declaring war.

And in advancing these claims, Dean Gooderham Acheson has never scrupled to lie and deceive when that seemed the most effective way of dealing with whatever might be disadvantageous to the aims and objectives in view.

There is a clue to the unscrupulous ruthlessness with which Mr. Acheson pursues his purposes in the testimony which he gave during the hearings on the aid program for Greece and Turkey. And there is an interesting contrast, here, to the tender solicitude which Mr.

Acheson now shows for the feelings of our allies in the Korean undertaking.

During the hearing Senator Hawkes argued that the United States should not proceed with the aid program without at least consulting the 49 other members of the United Nations "who normally go along with the United States," and without finding out "whether those 49 believed that the step we alone were taking was right and did not circumvent the United Nations."

But impatient Mr. Acheson would have none of that. He was strong for "going it alone" then. He said:

I think when it is quite clear that the thing you are doing is right, the thing to do is to go ahead and do it as quickly as possible.

And subsequently, in a letter to Senator GREEN, of Rhode Island, under date of April 18, 1947, Mr. Acheson advanced this added argument in support of non-consultation and completely independent action in the matter of the aid program:

The United Nations can be no stronger than its members, and their sovereign independence is an essential condition to the proper functioning of the organization.

There is a further clue to this impatient ruthlessness in carrying through what to Mr. Acheson is clearly right in a statement made in an address on September 10, 1940, as chairman of the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure before the American Bar Association:

There has never been a time or place in the history of the world when it was more important than now and here to judge success or failure in the practice of the art of government by pragmatic tests. Government must work. It must accomplish the public purposes for which the times call.

Naturally the impatient chancellor, the impatient advocate of the pragmatic test of government, could not always be expected to be tolerant of discussion and debate and the slower processes of the common herd. It is not surprising, therefore, to find him lecturing members of the United States Chamber of Commerce in this vein in 1943—a year when American unity under the compulsion of the war crisis was at its zenith:

To be capable of action, sustained and steadfast, this democracy and every other as well, must achieve unity of purpose upon the fundamentals. One of the most disturbing phenomena of our recent history has been the ease with which we relapse into bitter, partisan quarreling. * * *

Disagreement and debate are, of course, a part of the democratic process. But this is a means—and the best means we know—to an end. The end is decision—decision which is accepted by all—decision which results in action.

The first task before us then, if we are to act as a Nation, strong and determined to meet the challenge of our destiny, is to pull ourselves together, and to agree upon our fundamental course of action.

That, in 1943, mind you.

And again, the impatient chancellor lectured the country—this time speaking on June 4, 1946, before the Associated Harvard Clubs:

America faces problems which are difficult against a background of national confusion, hesitation, and disintegration. Americans as a people are not particularly suited for

the long and tough job ahead, but we are in for it and the only real question is whether we shall know it soon enough.

As the New York Times reported the speech, Mr. Acheson went on to explain that the chief trouble came from the fact that the fundamental task in the conduct of foreign affairs was focusing the will of 140,000,000 persons on problems beyond American shores. The people, he added:

Are focusing on 140,000,000 other things, or more accurately, not focusing on them, but getting very much mixed up with and about them, and the people of other countries are doing the same thing.

Of such convictions as these are compounded the strange contradictions and the dangerous qualities of the man Acheson—the condescending attitude toward the people of the United States and toward their elected representatives in Congress; the intolerant certainty that what he sees clearly as right is therefore right; the impatient urge to translate conviction into action as quickly as possible; the insistence upon the right of those in the executive branch of Government to make the decisions, the willingness to sacrifice truth itself when the ends appear to him to justify that sacrifice.

And yet, paradoxically, there is no one in public life today who has spoken more often or fulsomely of truth than Mr. Acheson.

The strange fact is that Mr. Acheson, who so scornfully refused to turn his back on Alger Hiss, has turned his back on all of his own professions of integrity and devotion to truth.

He has turned his back on the professions of the Dean Gooderham Acheson who, speaking as a former secretary to Justice Louis D. Brandeis, said in a funeral tribute to Mr. Justice Brandeis in 1941:

These were the years during which we were with the Justice and saw in action his burning faith that . . . evil never could be good; that falsehood was not truth, not even if all the ingenuity of science reiterated it in waves that encircled the earth.

When Dean Gooderham Acheson ordered the Voice of America and the information personnel and foreign representatives of the State Department to broadcast falsehoods regarding Formosa he turned his back on the noble sentiment he had himself once voiced:

That falsehood was not truth, not even if all the ingenuity of science reiterated it in waves that encircled the earth.

Dean Acheson had already turned his back on his own high professions when he made this comment during his press conference on January 5, 1950, interpreting President Truman's Formosa statement:

If we are going to maintain the free nations of the world as a great unit opposed to the encroachment of communism and other sorts of totalitarian aggression, the world must believe that we stand for principle and that we are honorable and decent people and that we do not put forward words, as propagandists do in other countries, to serve their advantage only to throw them overboard when some change in events makes the position difficult for us.

Yet, Mr. Acheson now tells the joint committees that the December 23, 1949, document—issued just 13 days before he made the statement just quoted—was nothing more or less than a propaganda line put forward in accordance with the common procedure for “dealing with things which are disadvantageous to us.”

And contrast the admission now made by Secretary Acheson with this high profession offered July 5, 1950—6 months after the Formosa document was circulated—to a Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee conducting hearings on Senator BENTON's proposal for “a greatly expanded program of information and education among all the peoples of the world.” Here is what Mr. Acheson said:

The sponsors of this resolution have accurately diagnosed one of the elements not only vital but in fact indispensable to the conduct of American foreign relations today. We must make the truth known to the peoples of the world. This is a task that calls for greatly expanded and intensified efforts.

Truth in the world today is a political force.

If totalitarian regimes cannot flourish where the truth is fully available, free and democratic countries cannot flourish unless their citizens do have access to the truth. The freedom of free nations grows out of the minds of its citizens. Free men make up their own minds, on the basis of free access to the truth, to the facts.

* * * The task of telling the truth, as the President has emphasized, is not “separate and distinct from other elements of our foreign policy. It is a necessary part of all we are doing to build a peaceful world.” It is essential to the success of our foreign policy that the military, political, and economic measures we are taking be accompanied by an effective information program. * * *

The democratic concept has depended on the ability of every man to learn the truth and to act as an individual on the basis of it.

Turn from that fine profession of loyalty to truth to the point-by-point instructions laid down by Mr. Acheson in the December 23, 1949, document for the spoon-feeding of falsehoods to the world, and to the American people, about the Formosan situation.

How can anyone hereafter have any confidence in Mr. Acheson's word?

How can even the President of the United States have any confidence in Mr. Acheson's word?

Aside from his compelling obligation to the American people to relieve the Nation of an intolerable situation, Mr. Acheson has a personal obligation to any concept of honor and integrity which may survive from those supposedly idealistic days when he worked at the elbow of Justice Louis D. Brandeis.

He can fulfill that obligation of honor and integrity only by immediately resigning as Secretary of State of the United States.

COMMEMORATIVE VETERANS' HOSPITAL FOR NEGRO VETERANS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 210 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the House resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in

order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 314) to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, as the reading of the resolution by the Clerk reflects, this resolution makes in order the consideration of H. R. 314, a bill for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington, in Franklin County, Va., at a cost of \$5,000,000. This is a very appropriate name for this hospital; a hospital to be named after a very distinguished member of the Negro race. I know of no opposition to this resolution, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not impose upon the time of the House for the present, at least.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank the Speaker, the leadership, and most of all the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] for postponing this bill which was to have been taken up on yesterday. As president of the board of trustees of the Rogers Hall School at Lowell, Mass., I presented diplomas yesterday to the finest graduating class of young girls I have ever seen. They will go out into the world and there will be no spread of communism from those girls. They will make a fine record of patriotic young womanhood. I was particularly anxious to be there and I am very grateful to the leadership of the House. I am sure that this resolution will be passed and we will have a chance to establish that hospital at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington, a great Negro, a great patriot, a great statesman. No finer tribute could be paid one of any race or creed than to have a hospital built in his honor. This is not a matter of segregation.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to this rule. However, I believe that it is important that someone convince us that this hospital is needed. It is estimated to cost \$5,000,000, and, in my opinion, the United States cannot spend millions of dollars unless it is absolutely necessary.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I will explain that when we come to discuss the bill, but let me say to the gentleman from Illinois that you could build 40 hospitals like this with the money that you have just given to Communist Nehru, of India.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, I think that this bill should be decided strictly on its merits. Is this hospital needed? That is the question. I again repeat that \$5,000,000, when this Nation is borrowing money each day, is something for the membership to think about.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from Illinois that we not only need this hospital but we need several more.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the rule.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Apropos of the colloquy between the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and the gentleman from Illinois, a member of the Rules Committee, I agree with what the gentleman from Illinois has said, that if the hospital is not needed we should not have it; but that is a matter that can be decided upon the consideration of the bill. I think the House should go ahead and adopt the resolution, and then let the bill be decided upon its merits.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee and the Rules Committee though that the hospital was needed for these Negro veterans, and they brought this resolution to the floor of the House. It can be decided upon its merits.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Did the gentleman say the membership of the Rules Committee decided that this hospital was needed, and therefore think the House ought to have an opportunity to discuss the merits of the bill?

Mr. COLMER. If the gentleman will permit me to confess to having been educated here this morning to do a little evading, in a previous colloquy, I would say that possibly I did not use the correct word. My choice of words was not too good when I said "decided." The Rules Committee decided in its wisdom that this was a matter that should come to the floor of the House for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 314) to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans at the birthplace of

Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 314, with Mr. PHILBIN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] has 30 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has already passed the House twice. It was thoroughly considered by the Veterans' Committee in the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses, and in the Eighty-second Congress, and was reported out and passed the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses, but somehow it was not voted on in the Senate. The same thing might be said of the other bill to provide the 16,000 beds so vitally needed throughout the country, and which is now pending before the Committee on Rules.

This bill is sponsored by the Booker T. Washington Foundation and by Booker Washington's daughter, Portia Washington Pittman. They came before the committee and answered every question that could be asked and the opposition was made to look ridiculous.

We have an all-Negro veterans' hospital at Tuskegee, Ala., the old home of Booker T. Washington, and it is the only veterans' hospital that I know of that has Negro physicians. We have quite a number of Negro doctors over the country that could supply this hospital. We have never had any trouble at Tuskegee. They have got along splendidly. What these people are asking for here is to have the same kind of hospital located in southwestern Virginia on the land already owned by the Booker Washington Foundation.

The Member from Illinois a while ago raised the question of the cost of \$5,000,000. You can hardly build a veterans' hospital for less money. Every hospital that we have proposed costs at least that amount. So, from a standpoint of cost, this has been held down to the irreducible minimum.

This bill is necessary. There are a vast number of Negro veterans in that area to be served by this hospital in the States of Kentucky, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. GOLDEN. Does the gentleman have the figure showing the number of colored veterans in the three States around the location of this hospital?

Mr. RANKIN. I do not believe we have that figure at the moment.

Mr. GOLDEN. I know that in my district we have a number of colored veterans who would like to have some place to go where they can be treated by their

own physicians and feel like they are a part of this Government.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

This gives an opportunity for these Negro doctors to work for and treat their own people and for them to be to themselves. That is what they want. The men who stick their noses into this fight and prate about the Negro question could not get into a Negro hospital with their consent. We are trying to do something for them and not do something to them. There are enough Negro veterans in the States adjacent to this hospital to supply the needs of the hospital just as there are in the Tuskegee Hospital at Tuskegee, Booker Washington's old home in Alabama. Negro veterans have gone from my district, they have gone from all over Mississippi, from Alabama, and from Georgia, and from Florida to that hospital, and we have never had the slightest trouble with them.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. GOLDEN. I have just been furnished with statistics showing that now there are 2,044 Negro veterans in hospitals in this immediate area, and, of course, a great many of them would like to go to the one that we are now proposing to build.

Mr. RANKIN. Why, certainly. We have a large number of them in the hospital at Richmond. We have a large number of them in the hospital at Roanoke. We have a large number of them in the hospital, probably, at Nashville, and other places in that immediate section.

I will be glad to answer any question that any of you have to ask.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Can the gentleman tell us the need for the hospital? That is going to be the deciding factor—whether they need these additional beds. I will say to the gentleman that, in my opinion, that is what is going to decide this question. If they need the hospital, then I think it is going to pass, and unless the membership can be convinced that they do need this hospital, the bill will not pass.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; they need this hospital because they need these beds. If you do not build this hospital, then you will have to expand other hospitals in that area to take care of them. There is no reason on earth why this hospital should not be built.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to state, and the gentleman probably already knows this, that there is an appalling number of colored amputees at the Walter Reed Hospital.

As the gentleman knows, we were given two lists of casualties; one of 78,000, and now they tell us it is 141,000. The men from Korea will be hospitalized in veterans' hospitals now. There will be great need.

It is my knowledge that the Negro veterans have not been taken care of as

much as they should be in veterans' hospitals.

Mr. RANKIN. My attention has been called to the fact that in April, this year, there were 20,940 veterans waiting to get into hospitals. You will either have to build this hospital or expand the ones already built, or build another one. This is the only one where these Negro doctors can go to show what they can do for their own people.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I stand second to no one in my desire to honor the memory of Booker T. Washington. I have some question, however, about whether this is the best way to do it. I wonder if the gentleman would tell me if it is true, as has been stated, that since the beginning of World War I there has been, up to the introduction of this bill, no effort at segregating our Negro soldiers.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know whether there has been any effort to segregate them in the hospitals or not.

Mrs. CHURCH. It is my understanding that our method is to recognize the same principle of nonsegregation as that under which they are put into battle. I had always hoped very much that there would be no effort made at any time, even in honoring the memory of a fine gentleman or in caring for our veterans, to further the principle of segregation, as this proposal undoubtedly does.

Mr. RANKIN. I would point out to the gentlewoman that the order wiping out segregation in the Armed Forces was the greatest victory that Stalin has won since Yalta. It has done more to break down the morale of the boys in the South and to disturb race relations than anything else that Truman has ever done. I do not know who put him up to it, but I do know that Stalin must have laughed behind his mustache when he heard it.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. There is one thing that worries me about the bill. At the present time they are actually closing wings of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals. Take the Deshon Hospital at Butler, Pa. They are closing the wings of that hospital because they lack doctors, nurses, and technicians. If we construct this hospital, where are you going to get the doctors, nurses, and technicians?

Mr. RANKIN. I will be very glad to answer the gentleman on that point. There is no use of my mincing any words with the gentleman. He knows that they put white doctors and white nurses in those hospitals. These Negro doctors could not get into a hospital in Pennsylvania in 10 years. These Negroes want to show what they can do for themselves. That is the thing that Booker T. Washington always preached: Teach the Negroes to do something for themselves, and not try to impose them on the white people.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I would like to correct the gentleman, because in Pennsylvania we do have Negro doctors.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, you may have one out of a thousand.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. We will have them in this hospital if you will locate the doctors for us.

Mr. RANKIN. They will get the doctors from that area.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows also that some of the finest medical papers that have been written have been written by Negro doctors.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, I do not know about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. When was this estimate of the cost of this hospital, \$5,000,000, made? Is that based on recent construction costs?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; these are recent figures; within the last year or two.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. It seems almost incredible to me that you could build a hospital for \$5,000,000.

Mr. RANKIN. If we were in India or some foreign country, it would probably cost \$50,000,000; but down at this place I think we can build it for \$5,000,000.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Will that equip the hospital also?

Mr. RANKIN. I think so.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I have some figures here, as of May 15, 1951, on the beds in the hospitals in North Carolina, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. It shows there has been authorized by law a total of 10,438; actually operating, 9,460; occupied, 8,293; reserved, 591; vacant, 561. Does the gentleman have any comment to make on those figures?

Mr. RANKIN. I think your figures cover the District of Columbia, which has a great many hospitals.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No. North Carolina, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia. There are only 335 in the District. The complete breakdown is as follows:

Beds in VA Hospitals as of May 15, 1951

State	Authorized by law	Operating, actually available	Occupied	Reserved	Vacant
North Carolina.....	2,412	1,830	1,582	139	109
Maryland.....	2,401	2,401	2,242	81	78
Virginia.....	3,704	3,610	3,186	167	257
West Virginia.....	1,686	1,284	1,006	178	100
District of Columbia.....	335	335	277	26	32
Total.....	10,438	9,460	8,293	591	576

I believe these figures are accurate, and if they are it would not indicate the need that has been stated.

Mr. RANKIN. Where did those figures come from?

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER. I wonder if the gentleman could tell me if the hospital that was constructed for the Veterans' Administration at Ironwood, Mich., I believe it is, is now operating.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know; I could not answer.

Mr. SHAFER. It was built some 3 or 4 years ago and it was not opened yet 2 years ago. I am just wondering if we are unable to get doctors and so forth—

Mr. RANKIN. I cannot answer the question now, but I will get the gentleman the information later.

Mr. SHAFER. And I would just suggest that possibly these colored boys could go up there.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; they do not want to go up there, if you want to know the truth about it.

Mr. SHAFER. We have several million dollars invested in the hospital.

Mr. RANKIN. If you really want to do something for these Negroes this is the way to do it.

Mr. SHAFER. We realize you do not want to take them back down South.

Mr. RANKIN. Not after they have been to Michigan.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. I preface my remarks by saying that any program or project to honor the memory of the late Booker T. Washington is a laudable one. I want to ask the gentleman this question prefaced by this statement: In my own district in Nashville, Tenn., is one of the great medical colleges of the country, Maharrrie Medical College for Negroes. I wish to ask the gentleman if we authorize this hospital and it is to be built honoring the memory of Booker T. Washington, would the gentleman see any real objection to locating the hospital near the Maharrrie Medical College in Nashville, still calling it the Booker T. Washington Hospital, and enabling them to staff the hospital from that medical college?

Mr. RANKIN. I certainly would. I will tell the gentleman why.

Mr. PRIEST. I shall be happy to learn the gentleman's reasons.

Mr. RANKIN. That row has been raised by the American Medical Association, and I am not willing to make guinea pigs out of the Negroes. The American

Medical Association fell under the influence and control of this fellow Fish-bein who virtually closed medical schools all over this country and brought about this shortage of doctors. I am not willing to locate any veterans' hospital near a medical school just in order to provide guinea pigs for boys who are studying medicine.

Mr. PRIEST. Neither do I want to make guinea pigs of any of our soldiers, Negro or white, but I do know of my personal knowledge that this is a fine medical school and for that reason I am asking the gentleman the question.

Mr. RANKIN. And I am giving the gentleman my answer.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. DOLLINGER. The gentleman made the observation that they had permitted Negroes to have certain doctors.

Mr. RANKIN. I did not say "Negroes."

Mr. DOLLINGER. Here is the question I wanted to ask, or the statement I wanted to make, and that is that this disease, segregation, is a disease that this Congress ought to cure.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, the gentleman cannot cure it himself and I do not think the intelligent Negroes are interested in what the gentleman thinks.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I understand this hospital will be known as the Booker T. Washington Hospital. Does that mean that the policy of the gentleman's committee has been changed and that we may expect his committee to name these hospitals in the future?

Mr. RANKIN. This bill does not provide a name, I may say to the gentleman, but it places it at his old home in Virginia.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. Would the gentleman mind telling us—I understood him to say that this hospital if erected would be for Negro veterans and would be staffed by Negro doctors. Is there any difference in the surgical or medical technique of Negro doctors, or in the needs of Negro veterans as against white veterans, or vice versa, or in anything that a white doctor can prescribe and perform that a Negro doctor cannot?

Mr. RANKIN. Let me point out to the gentleman this Negro, George Washington Carver, brought information that the Negroes had gathered in Africa for a thousand years. The gentleman himself would probably be amazed if he would get that book and read it.

I would like to know where they could get any better treatment than these Negroes get in the Tuskegee Hospital that is staffed entirely by Negro doctors and nurses. Everyone in charge of that hospital is a Negro. They are getting along splendidly, but that is what the opposition wants to displace.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. The less they know about the Negroes the more questions they want to ask. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. WIER. I wish to refer to a question which was asked a moment ago on this floor. Comment was made a minute ago about the need for hospitalization of veterans in the areas of West Virginia, North and South Carolina, and Virginia.

Mr. RANKIN. Ask the question.

Mr. WIER. Just a moment.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, I cannot yield for a statement.

Mr. WIER. I am going to ask the question.

Mr. RANKIN. All right.

Mr. WIER. It is not over 2 weeks ago, when the armed services bill was before the House, that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] took the floor and pleaded for an amendment that he offered in which he requested the exemption of certain doctors and medical attendants so that they could open up a brand new hospital at Clarksburg, W. Va., I think it was. The same thing applies, Mr. Chairman, at Minot, N. Dak.; the same thing applies in Montana. Apparently we have a lot of these monuments, or pork barrels in these various districts that are merely monuments.

Mr. RANKIN. No; no; this is not a monument. It is a Negro veterans' hospital. Those Negro doctors could not get into the hospitals that the gentleman just mentioned but they can get into this one, if you pass this bill.

There ought not to be any opposition to it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, as has been stated, this bill passed the House of Representatives twice; both in the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses, with not a vote against it so far as I can recall. It came out of our committee, I think, unanimously; at least, that is my recollection. I can see no reason for its not passing and every reason for its passing. When the Veterans' Administration gave us figures of 21,000 veterans on the waiting list, they did not take into consideration the vast number of NP or T3 cases that are to be hospitalized in Veterans' Administration hospitals by order of General Marshall; also, since we passed the bill about 2 weeks ago, ordering the hospitalization of Korean veterans, a bill which should have been passed a year ago, these veterans previously could not secure hospitalization, and since that time we have had a very heavy load, unfortunately, of Korean veterans applying for hospitalization. It is often very difficult for colored veterans to secure hospitalization. They have not been treated too fairly. Also, I think it is a very great step in the right direction for the Negro doctors. They can practice in this hospital, and they will do great work. They are fine doctors, very fine surgeons, and the colored people want them.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has completed hearings on the measure and has considered it from

every angle. Resolutions in support of the bill were received from the National Baptist Convention, representing 4,000,000 Negro Baptists and from the Benevolent Protective Order of Elks of the World, representing 500,000 loyal Americans. Each of these resolutions pointed out that the establishment of such a hospital would assist in perpetuating the ideals and teachings of Booker T. Washington. The colored people have every reason to be extremely proud of Booker T. Washington. The fine work that is being done by Negroes throughout the country is a great tribute to Booker T. Washington, and it should be encouraged and should be continued. I can see no reason for raising the cry of segregation about this hospital. We have other special hospitals for special groups, and that cry is not raised. I think this measure should pass by a very large majority; in fact, I think it should pass unanimously. We are going to need hospital beds, and I think this Congress will be blamed as it is now blamed for not having provided them. The Committee on Rules has before it a bill which will provide the building of hospitals to accommodate 16,000 more beds. It is still buried in the Committee on Rules. The House passed that bill last year unanimously, the Senate did not pass it, so it is back for consideration again. I would like to say to the House that here is a hospital, if we pass this bill, that will be ready to take veterans that are very much in need of treatment. I think I told you of the great number of colored amputees at the Walter Reed Hospital. We are going to be blamed for not providing hospitalization that we could provide.

There is no question in my mind as to the need for new hospitals for the Veterans' Administration. I spoke at some length on this phase of the problem on May 3. Since that time we have enacted Public Law No. 28, which gives full medical, hospital, and domiciliary benefits to all persons who have served in the Armed Forces after June 27, 1950, the opening date of the Korean conflict. The burden that this authorization places upon the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration is one that will be critical and difficult to administer. Hospitals cannot be constructed and placed in operation overnight. After completion is usually takes about 10 months before one is fully operative.

It might be pertinent to say here that on April 15, 1951, there were 21,126 disabled veterans upon the waiting lists for hospitalization. Of this number 20,940 were non-service-connected cases, or at least they were classified as such. In all fairness, it should be stated again that there are many thousands of veterans in hospitals who are listed as nonservice connected but who also had service-connected disabilities. They were admitted as non-service-connected cases because the major diagnosis was that of non-service-connected disability. Add to these cases the hundreds of others who are now rated as nonservice connected but will be des-

ignated as service connected after complete adjudication of their claims, and the picture changes materially.

The authorization of \$5,000,000 called for in this bill will erect a 200-bed hospital. It is needed, and I, for one, do not believe that the question of segregation is a factor in its authorization.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I was much impressed with the argument put up by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] when he urged that this hospital, which I concede to be a very fine thing, be placed near a medical center. I agree with that. That is the concept to which all veterans' organizations in the State of Minnesota have come. We have come to the conclusion that we should have our veterans' hospitals near the big medical centers, the Mayo Clinic, for example, and the Twin Cities areas, both of which are entirely out of my district. I for one will not advocate the establishment of a veterans' hospital in my congressional district, because we do not have the medical facilities, research staffs, and so forth, that are needed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I should like to say to the gentleman that this is less than 30 miles from a large Veterans' Administration hospital at Roanoke, Va., which has segregated wards caring for 500 Negro veterans.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I hope the gentlewoman will agree with some of us from the Middle West in the continued demand here for hospitalization and the proposal before us today for this new hospital, that we have been attempting in the Middle West for some time to take care of a large segment of veterans who have been removed or are being eliminated from our present veterans' hospitals. We are attempting in the Middle West to reopen and reactivate Schick Hospital at Clinton, Iowa, for domiciliary cases.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have been fighting my head off to have that opened. It is a scandal that we do not insist that hospitals be opened to take care of this load. Take the mental hospitals in Massachusetts, each of which is carrying a load of 0.06 percent over capacity, a very dangerous thing indeed. I know a hospital should be opened in the Middle West.

Mr. WIER. Then why should I be expected here to vote for a \$5,000,000 brand new hospital to be constructed when we already have unused hospitals?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I do not feel that way about it. I feel that if we can get this hospital we should. I should like to have more hospital beds in my own district, many more, but I am not going to vote against this just for that reason. You will need your beds in the West. Unfortunately, I think we will need thousands and thou-

sands more. There are two estimates on the casualty list, one of 141,000 and the original estimate of 78,000. That 141,000 list includes, unfortunately, amputees. They are not called war casualties. Mental cases are not called war casualties.

At Walter Reed Hospital they are overcrowded. They are pushing them from ward to ward, not giving the men in the hospital proper care, because they are turning them out too soon.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. How many beds would there be in this proposed \$5,000,000 hospital?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Two hundred beds.

Mr. ROONEY. How many doctors would be required?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I do not have that figure here but I could get it for the gentleman. Probably 14. It is a great chance for the colored people to have their own doctors in hospitals. Also it is a great thing for the colored nurses. They make very fine nurses. I have visited Tuskegee, and I know the fine care they get there.

Mr. ROONEY. It is proposed that the medical staff include white doctors?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think some may go there, but it would be chiefly colored doctors. I think the colored people like that. I know many colored persons, and they like their colored doctors.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the lady yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The bill we have for the 16,000 hospital beds, that is now pending before the Rules Committee, covers the entire country. I think it will take care of the gentleman's situation.

Mr. ROONEY. I voted for it.

Mr. RANKIN. I know the gentleman did.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, and the gentleman from New York knows that we fought very hard for it and the House of Representatives voted for 16,000 beds, and you appropriated the money for that. A lot of us have fought for the continuation of the building of those hospitals. I think this is going to help you in getting your beds.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. I am sure the gentlewoman will not find fault with my pronunciation of the word "Negro," as the distinguished chairman did.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have always said "Negro."

Mr. MULTER. It never sounds like anything but "Negro" when the gentlewoman and I use the word.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am from a part of the country where they do not pronounce it in any other way.

Mr. MULTER. Is it the position of the committee that sponsors this bill that the Negro veterans throughout the South are not being hospitalized and are not getting hospital care?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I cannot speak for the committee, but it is my contention that they are not getting as much care as they should. They are not getting hospitalization as quickly as they should either. They have to wait for hospitalization. This will help them immensely in their care. It will be their own hospital. I think it is a great thing for them.

Mr. MULTER. I cannot understand that, because in New York we do not have that difficulty. We have Negro doctors and Negro nurses working side by side with white doctors and white nurses, treating white and Negro patients in the same hospitals. I cannot understand why you need 200 beds to take care of just Negroes who need hospitalization.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have felt that all over the country we have Negroes who have more difficulty in securing hospitalization than the white people. I think this will be a tremendous boon to the colored people. I have never been for segregation of any kind. I have worked on their claims for compensation for years. I am not speaking of this as a novice. Many may know much more than I do, but I have had experience. I have had experience with their claims. As you know, prompt hospitalization of a veteran means that his claim has a much better chance of being service-connected and opens all kinds of doors to him.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. As I understand it, this hospital which is proposed to be constructed will serve the States of Kentucky, Tennessee, West Virginia, and Virginia, and the immediately surrounding territory?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is supposed to, but I think also if it has the beds it will take in the colored people of other areas, also.

Mr. CHELF. Is this figure correct which I have before me, that there are some 51,000 Negro veterans in the State of Virginia alone?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The State of Virginia has a very large Negro population and all those men have not received the compensation or hospitalization that they should have.

Mr. CHELF. This particular hospital will have only 200 beds?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is right, it is a very small number, really.

Mr. CHELF. In my opinion the gentlewoman is correct, and I shall be happy to vote for this bill.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I believe I can support this bill if one question is cleared up for

me, and that is: When this hospital is built, will it be anywhere adjacent to a medical center or an institution of learning where they teach medicine and where they have all the facilities that are necessary to properly operate a hospital in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed to operate a standard hospital commensurate with the National Hospital Association?

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman that they have medical schools and medical centers on all sides of the proposed hospital.

Mr. JONAS. How close are they?

Mr. RANKIN. Well, someone said there was a school 10 miles away and another one probably 15 miles. But they are close enough.

Mr. JONAS. If they are within 10 or 15 miles then it is all right. I have had some experience with hospitals, and if they are within 10 or 15 miles they will redound to the benefit of this hospital. But when you get beyond the 20- or 25-mile limit you get in trouble because you cannot get the doctors and the nurses to go there. Medicine is a highly specialized science today and you cannot operate a hospital if it is too far away from the seat of learning.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand that Roanoke, Va., is less than 15 miles away.

Mr. JONAS. Then maybe it may work out all right.

Mr. CHELF. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. CHELF. Have you experienced any difficulty or trouble in the past about getting a sufficient staff necessary for these Negro hospitals?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No; my understanding is that over a period of quite a good many years there has never been any difficulty.

Mr. CHELF. Do you anticipate any trouble in this particular instance?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No; there has never been any difficulty. You will have your patients and you will have your doctors and you will have your nurses and attendants. I think this hospital will be a great success and a great credit to everybody.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON. Did the gentleman say that there was an outstanding medical center near this proposed hospital?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is my understanding, that Roanoke is very near. I am sorry, perhaps I did not hear the gentleman's question fully.

Mr. DAWSON. Is there a medical school at Roanoke?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They have training there for doctors.

Mr. DAWSON. How many Negro doctors are there in Roanoke?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I cannot give the gentleman that information.

Mr. DAWSON. How many Negro inhabitants are there in Roanoke?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the doctors can easily be trained there if it is necessary to do that.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We have had brought out several times in the past 5 or 6 years in the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Labor and Federal Security, that there are only two colleges in America, Howard University here and one in Nashville, where they instruct young Negro students in the art of medicine. Yet here we have a proposition before us which seeks to locate a hospital for the Negro race 200 miles away from any center which has to do with instructing Negro doctors. I do not think that is the right thing to do, and I think we should seriously consider following the suggestion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] and locate this hospital somewhere in the vicinity of Nashville.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. As I understand it this bill provides for a hospital for Negro veterans to be staffed by Negro doctors; is that correct?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is the understanding, although there may be some white doctors there also.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The point I want to make is that there is no school anywhere near the proposed location of this hospital which trains Negro doctors.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I may say to the gentleman it would be very easy to send those Negro doctors away to be trained and bring them back to work in this hospital.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I would not want to argue that point, but someone brought up the point that if this were close enough to a recognized training school they would be for it, and I did not want any misconception in anybody's mind about that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understood the gentleman to mean any hospital where they were training doctors. You have doctors being trained in nearby Roanoke and other hospitals.

Mr. CHELF. What difference does it make if the medical center is a thousand miles away? If those Negro veterans are there and if they need to be serviced and if they need to go to the hospital, why should the hospital not be constructed where they are located? It does not make any difference how far the school is away from the hospital. They can fly there or go by train, or they can walk, if necessary.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Also it will be a great boon to the Negro doctors.

Mr. CHELF. This question of location near a medical center does not appeal to me. It is a question of locating the hospital where it is needed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Of course.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the lady yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The Negro veterans' hospital at Tuskegee, Ala., is farther removed from any Negro medical center than this institution would be. They have got along splendidly. I know what I am talking about. I have been chairman of the Veterans Committee for almost 20 years, and I have been in touch with every veterans' hospital and representatives of those hospitals. I know they are getting along splendidly at Tuskegee. They are not up against a medical school, and therefore these sick and wounded veterans are not used as guinea pigs.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman.

I want to repeat the statement I made previously: I have never been in favor of segregation. I believe the testimony before our committee by the daughter of Booker T. Washington, Mrs. Portia Washington Pittman, is most significant. She said:

As far as segregation is concerned, I think this hospital would help there because of the psychological effect that the name Booker T. Washington has on the colored people. And I think these veterans who go there would also come to believe, like him, that if we are offered opportunities as a race for education and other things, that this matter of segregation will take care of itself; it will disappear without agitation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. What difference does it make as to where the doctors are trained? They are trained in any training school that takes medical students. I have attended a great many of them and have seen a great many of them. I have not seen any place where there are not Negro students. I do not think there is any particular law or regulation against it.

As to the question of being close to a medical center, about the only reason for that is that every well-equipped veterans' hospital has about all the machinery that would be needed in any other veterans' hospital, no matter where they are located. The only advantage in being contiguous to any large medical center would be for the use of medical consultants. I think the average medical attendant at any Veterans' Administration hospital would be perfectly competent to take care of anything that might come up in the ordinary way. The salaries which they ordinarily pay at the Veterans' Administration hospitals are not large enough usually to cover the necessary special skills required; for instance, such as medical consultants. There are many specialized conditions which might come up where it would be a distinct advantage to be within 50 miles, but with modern travel, especially in the East, I would not figure that 30-mile or 10-mile deal would have much to do with it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland, General DEVEREUX.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill.

As a member of the committee, I made an effort to find out something about the bill. I found that hearings had been held previously, and therefore I was restricted to the report.

First, I think it is bad legislation and that it is very definitely class legislation. From reading the report I have not been able to determine that any need has been shown for this particular hospital at this particular place.

The question of staffing the hospital also arose. I think it has been brought out on the floor today that we have many hospital beds now available where patients cannot be taken because we do not have a sufficient staff. I might also point out that the Veterans' Administration is opposed to this particular legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson].

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I regret that we have to take the floor at this time, but I feel that I could not be fair to my conscience, and I could not be fair to you if I did not express myself on the present legislation.

I am opposed to the legislation for the reason that, first, it is class legislation; there is no reason under the sun why this Federal Government should build a hospital for Negroes any more than it should build hospitals for Italians, for Japanese, or any other section of its citizenry. Certainly, we are going to care for our veterans. We would be an ungrateful people if we did not do that. But when you begin to pick out the veterans and classify them by either color, religion, or nationality, you are departing from every fundamental principle upon which this Government was founded.

This Nation has honored Booker T. Washington as it has honored few of its citizens. In the Hall of Fame you will see his bust, placed there not because he was a Negro but because he was a human being who made a contribution to humanity. Professor Carver was one of the greatest scientists this country has ever produced. He made his great contribution not to the Negroes but to all America. His research into the possibilities of the peanut created for the farmers of this country—not the Negro farmers but the farmers of this country—created for them one of the greatest markets for a farm product that has ever been made by one man's effort. Why, then, should we today do a thing that is not honorable in the name of Booker T. Washington, a man who has already been honored by this great Nation high above any honor that will ever come possibly to any man or woman now sitting here in this Congress? To honor his name further, therefore, is not necessary. Neither does a condition exist where there should be 200 beds set aside in a small place down in a small community for Negro veterans.

We Negroes have good doctors, doctors who know the anatomy of man. I can recite to you that the first successful operation on a human heart was

made by a Negro doctor, not because he was a Negro, but because he was a doctor who had given study to the anatomy of man, to the physiology of man, until he knew every muscle, every nerve. It matters not whether the skin of a human being be black or white; the heart is the same within the body.

Since when has it become necessary to get a Negro doctor to wait upon a Negro patient? I can remember the days in the South when there were but few Negro doctors here and there, but there were thousands, and thousands, and thousands of human beings to be cared for. The white doctors did not count the color of the patient then; they knew that their job as a doctor was to cure the human being. We must see man as a human being wherever we find him if we are to make progress. We have a scarcity of doctors among us just like you have a scarcity of doctors among you.

Do you think for 1 minute that as long as there is a scarcity of doctors we are going to get them to leave their lucrative practices and go down and isolate themselves in this isolated community? They are not going to do that any more than the leading doctors of your group are going to leave their lucrative practices in the big cities and seek work in the veterans' hospitals at less pay. That is why we have a scarcity of doctors in the veterans' hospitals.

So I submit to you that the proponents of this legislation have shown no reason why they should build this hospital to honor Booker Washington who has already been so highly honored; they have shown no need for these additional veterans' facilities specifically in the case of Negro veterans, for they can go into any Government hospital supported by the taxpayers' money—and that is as it should be. I therefore submit to you that there is no purpose in this legislation that will be a good purpose or serve the interests of this country at this time, or to serve the interest of the veterans at this time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. It has been said that there are 20,000 veterans awaiting hospitalization.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There are many more than 20,000.

Mr. JAVITS. There are at least 20,000 veterans awaiting hospitalization. Many of those are Negroes. I am very pleased to have kept this bill from passing on the Consent Calendar as long ago as March 19 by my objections because I believe that it is fundamentally unsound and turns the clock back toward segregation instead of directly away from it, the direction we must go if we wish to have freedom. Will the gentleman tell us whether he feels that Negroes desire to have preference over white veterans in getting into veterans' hospitals?

Mr. DAWSON. We do not desire preference in fighting, in dying, in living. All that we want is equal opportunity with every other human being.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. I heartily agree with the statement of the gentleman about the question where this hospital is to be located and the facilities that will be available to carry on the necessary functions that hospitals must engage in. I presume the gentleman knows that since 1944 there has been a shortage of nurses in this country to the extent of 40,000 a year and that the number of doctors has gone down to a state now where it has become a calamity.

Mr. DAWSON. That is right.

Mr. JONAS. Unless you have the facilities where you can take advantage of the doctors and the nurses and the personnel that is required to staff a hospital, such as is possible in large centers, you cannot run a hospital.

Mr. DAWSON. The gentleman is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to say to the gentleman that I, too, feel that the colored people should have an equal chance with the white people, and that is one reason that I am favoring this bill, because of my very long years of experience I know that the colored people have more difficulty in getting hospitalization than the white people. I have always been against segregation, but I do not consider this to be segregation.

Mr. DAWSON. Would the gentleman support an amendment to take the word "Negro" out?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Not in this case because I feel this is being fair to the veterans, to the doctors, and you will have more colored nurses as the result to relieve the medical situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I am unalterably opposed to this bill. You may take the pledged word of my colleague, the gentleman from the First District of Illinois [Mr. Dawson] and myself, the only two Negro Members of this body, when we speak for Negro people in this House on this issue. I think you ought to respect that. There is not a single organization in this country, North or South, of any established reputation, of our race, that is in favor of this bill.

I want to present a couple of other things. I want you to know that those organizations that are supposed to be in favor of this bill are looked upon as organizations of disrepute by the people of our race, meaning Mr. Dawson and me.

I want you to also think carefully as to who owns this land where this hospital is going to be built. I make no charges, but that matter should be examined. I know about Franklin County. That is where my dad was born. My dad was born next door to Booker T. Washington in a log cabin at the junction of two creeks, one called the Maggoty and the

other called Soak. I know who owns this land and I know the so-called foundation in back of this movement.

The Veterans' Administration is opposed to this bill, and always has been, beginning when General Bradley was in charge. I would like to point out further that there are 1,000 vacant beds right now in the Veterans' Administration. Do you know why? Because they cannot get the doctors and nurses for them. I shall talk about this later when I offer a motion to strike out the enacting clause.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG].

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this proposal. I recognize full well the reasons for the opposition to this bill, and I have deep respect for those who would oppose it because of the reasons they have given. I understand full well why they feel that this is class legislation. I would like to remind them, however, that we have recently legislated for the Indians in this country. That was nothing but class legislation. The reason given was because of the need of the American Indians and because of the peculiar circumstances surrounding the need of that particular race. I grant most of what has been said here in opposition to the bill so far as class legislation is concerned, but I would like to speak for one moment as one who is personally interested in this proposal. I have the honor of being a trustee of the Booker T. Washington Memorial Trade School, at Roanoke, Va. Three weeks ago I was driven about the site of the proposed hospital and was given full information in regard to the need of this facility. I can say to you that regardless of our feelings as to what type of legislation it is, the thing for us to decide is whether or not these Negro veterans are getting a square deal under the present circumstances. I do not believe that they are. I respect the remarks of the gentleman who has just spoken. He may know more about the ownership of this land than I do. I agree with him that procurement of the land ought to be looked into carefully, just like any other purchase made by the Government. But, I am sure if he will go back there among his own people, he will find that there is actual need in that part of the country for a hospital for Negro veterans. Certainly, if the need is there, and it can be filled in this way, let us not wait indefinitely until we can overcome the problems that might arise by granting them facilities along with members of other races. Let us relieve a situation that needs to be remedied at the present time. I think that by passing this bill we will be facing it in the right way.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. Let me remind the gentleman that Indians are the wards of this Nation, and there is no comparison there. In the second place, the gentleman says there is a need. Are not Negro veterans being taken care of now?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I will say to the gentleman that Indians should be no more wards of the Government than Negroes or whites or members of any other race.

Mr. POWELL. Negroes are not wards; I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Since the Indians are being taken care of on that basis, I think we certainly have a precedent where there is a group within a race that is not being cared for adequately. I think certainly we ought to open our hearts to them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. POWELL. Are Negro veterans being taken care of now?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am assured that they are being taken care of adequately in some areas of the country. In other areas, I doubt very much that they are getting a square deal.

Mr. POWELL. I do not want to differ with the gentleman, but the Veterans' Administration tells me they are being taken care of in every area of this country. I have no personal reports coming to me from individuals and from groups stating that they are not being taken care of.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Nevertheless there is a tremendous sentiment among leaders of Negro groups, with full respect for the gentleman's remarks in regard to those backing this bill. I am sure the gentleman did not mean those fine people led by Dr. S. J. Phillips, the head of the Booker T. Washington School. It seems to me that people like that, who desire this facility, should be given due consideration.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. The question has come up as to white veterans in Franklin County and this area. If this is to be labeled a hospital for Negroes, would the white veterans in that area who might need medical attention automatically be excluded and thereby discriminated against?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would consider that a discrimination were it not for the fact that, as the gentleman certainly knows, white veterans have a preponderance of facilities over the colored veterans.

Mr. FULTON. Yes; but in this area, suppose an emergency occurs involving a white veteran, and this is labeled a Negro veterans' hospital; could that white veteran be admitted?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I think the Veterans' Administration has full authority to admit him in case of an emergency.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. There is a white veterans' hospital in Roanoke, Va.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. In the same section.

Mr. RANKIN. Down at Tuskegee, Ala., they have had a Negro hospital since the First World War. They have had no such questions raised, and we have had no trouble with it.

Mr. FULTON. If there are these veterans' hospitals there, is there, then, regardless of the discrimination, need for further facilities?

Mr. RANKIN. I have answered that question. Of course, if they did not need these facilities they would not ask for them.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am thinking of this purely on humanitarian grounds. Certainly none of us wants to further the cause of segregation. I could go into detail in regard to that, and in regard to how we have handled the matter in Missouri and elsewhere. For many years I was a member of the Inter-Racial Commission of the South, and I believe that I know something of this problem. I am putting it purely on the basis of need of our Negro veterans, and I believe the need should be met.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to you that of all the people I have ever met who honored and revered Booker T. Washington it was his daughter, Portia Washington Pittman, who came before the committee and testified for this institution. She has done everything she possibly could because she knows it is best for the people involved—whites and colored.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Did the gentleman have anyone appear in opposition to the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Nobody wanted to. Some men on the committee undertook to question Portia and she took care of it in a most magnificent manner.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the Veterans' Administration favor the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. The Veterans' Administration, I understand, is not in favor of any of these new hospitals.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is there any difference between the illness of a Negro and the illness of a white man?

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Since the Veterans' Administration is not in favor of this legislation, may I ask what the position of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is on it?

Mr. RANKIN. The Bureau of the Budget is against it. I suppose they will be against all expenditures for veterans' legislation if they had to pass on all of them. I want to say that the Veterans' Administration expressed no opinion on it. If you want to know who is interested in the Negroes of the South you go down there. You do not have to go to New York or Chicago to find out. Nobody is more interested in the Negroes of the South than Booker Washington's daughter. Nobody is more interested in the Negroes of the South than this Dr. Phillips, whose testimony, or at least a part of which, I am going to read to you.

He appeared before the committee. He said:

I would like to say this. I am favoring the veterans' hospital for Negro veterans being established at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington. I believe it would be a great inspiration to our people.

One thing that the Negro appreciates is recognition, and you would perhaps be surprised to know how this would arouse their appreciation and interest, for the Government to recognize in this manner the birthplace of Booker T. Washington, by placing a veterans' hospital there.

Further, it would give employment to our professional people in different lines, our people from the various classes of training they have had. And we have had training in this by our complete management of the hospital for Negro veterans which is located in Alabama.

He refers to Tuskegee Hospital. All the talk that has been advanced here has not produced a word to contradict what Dr. Phillips or what Portia Washington Pittman has said. This hospital should be built without any question.

The real opposition is coming from a Communist front organization that cannot use these Booker T. Washington Negroes and are therefore against the Negro veterans' hospital.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized and directed to acquire at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va., a suitable site and erect thereon a hospital for Negro veterans.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. POWELL moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I did not want to do this, but since the issue has been brought out in the open, I would like you, my colleagues, to know that the only organization in back of this segregated Jim Crow hospital is the Booker T. Washington Memorial Foundation. This so-called Dr. Phillips, the leader, has not the slightest bit of status whatsoever among his own people. Investigation will show that the land to be used for this Jim Crow hospital is owned and controlled by Dr. Phillips and the Booker T. Washington Memorial Foundation.

Furthermore, this Congress minted a half-dollar with Booker T. Washington's likeness upon it and allowed this organization to sell a United States Government half dollar for \$2. With the \$1.50 profit that they have been making from this, they have spent 90 percent paying salaries, and only 10 percent for supposedly doing good. I do not believe another bit of legislation should be passed, directly or indirectly, influenced by the Booker T. Washington Memorial Foundation until that foundation has been investigated and an accounting made of the moneys they have taken in from the sale of United States half-dollars.

I do not want to raise this question in its entirety, but since the names were brought out by the gentleman from

Mississippi—since the names of Dr. Phillips and Portia Washington were brought out, I must bring this out and I must raise this question and tell you these facts. You are dealing with something that smells to high heaven. I am not accusing anyone. I am telling you that something smells here when you are going to build a Jim Crow hospital 35 miles from the nearest town in a waste wilderness, where there are only two creeks and you are going to spend \$5,000,000.

The Veterans' Administration is not in favor of this, and I defy anyone to point out a word by testimony or letter where the Veterans' Administration has been in favor of this this last year, or any year that it has been brought up. The Director of the Budget is against it, and Heaven knows, the Negro men that are fighting, bleeding, and dying today in Korea are against it.

Negroes are being taken care of today. Name me a single veterans hospital that is called a "white" hospital today. There is no such thing as a "white" veterans hospital. Every single veterans hospital in this country, except one Jim Crow hospital which was set up back in old World War I days when we had a segregated Navy, Air Corps, and Army—every single veterans' hospital today is open to Negroes and is serving them and taking care of them.

I therefore ask that you support my motion and kill this bill.

If I am not telling the truth, will the chairman of this committee now rise and say I am not telling the truth?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. With reference to the location of this hospital, there has been some talk that the Veterans' Administration might be taking a neutral position. Here is the way they describe the spot where this is to be located:

An isolated community, remote from a medical center and where the matter of adequate staffing would be attained with considerable difficulty in any event.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to find justification for this legislation. Whatever one's views may be regarding the necessity for or desirability of passing any of the many bills now pending known as civil-rights measures, certainly it must be recognized that the advocacy of this bill goes far beyond mere passive opposition to legislation to strengthen the civil rights of our citizens. This bill, if it became law, would place the hallmark of affirmative Federal approval on a policy of segregation based on race or color. Apart from the possible unconstitutional implications, that seems a backward step which this Congress should not take.

I recognize that mutual good will and respect are preferable to legal compul-

sion as a method of solving many of the intricate problems involved in the various civil-rights issues. While it appears to me that we have been slow in enacting legislation to help this process along, it can properly and encouragingly be said that there are many evidences of improvement in race relations through purely voluntary efforts and the natural evolution of a more enlightened viewpoint. There seems to me a very great danger that the passage of this bill would have a tendency to reverse this commendable trend.

We are asked here to provide that Negro veterans who have fought side by side with their white brothers to defend our country, many of them in non-segregated units, be now set apart for necessary medical treatment in a separate hospital, instead of being accorded equal treatment in the same hospital with the same medical and surgical personnel, the same equipment and the same facilities which are used in the treatment of other veterans. All our fighting men, whatever their color, faced a common enemy, fought under one flag, and offered an equal sacrifice. When it comes to treatment for their wounds or disabilities, I can see no reason why they should then be told for the first time that a new factor, the color of their skin, is to determine where they are to be hospitalized.

Apart from the inherent unfairness to certain veterans, there is a broader aspect to this legislation which makes it objectionable. We are engaged throughout the world in a battle for men's minds, the successful outcome of which may conceivably prevent the cataclysm of another global conflict or, at least, contribute to the eventual success of our side in that struggle, if it cannot be avoided.

We profess universally, and I believe with the utmost sincerity, that we want to help to establish peace, justice and fair dealing among the peoples of all races everywhere, not just the white people of the earth, but those of every color, race, and creed. Yet, the eloquent voice of America proclaiming these noble sentiments loses much of its effectiveness if its legislative body enacts a measure which has the effect of setting apart for separate treatment one segment of our own people in the manner contemplated here. Let us not thus handicap our continuing and vitally necessary effort to win everywhere not only friends, but converts to the principles and ideals which we as a Nation proudly cherish and proclaim.

There is another reason why this bill should be opposed. The evidence presented by the Veterans' Administration Administrator is very clear that there is no need for this hospital at this time. Within a radius of 200 miles of the spot where it is proposed to locate this hospital there are already eight other veterans' hospitals. Another is to be opened in the near future and a tenth and eleventh are under way. There is no claim made that Negro veterans have been excluded from these hospitals or that they have not been accorded the

same treatment as others. Nor is it contended that any veteran in this area, Negro or white, has been deprived of treatment because of lack of hospital facilities.

In addition, the proposed location of this hospital is not recommended by the Veterans' Administration Administrator. It is in an isolated section, far from any centers of population and remote from any medical center where the problem of acquiring and retaining adequate and competent staff, always acute, would be multiplied many fold. There is no apparent purpose behind this legislation except to segregate Negro veterans from all others and accord them separate treatment. That is not in accord with the principles which we profess at home or which we preach abroad. The bill should be defeated. This motion should prevail.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask the members of this committee to support my motion to strike out the enacting clause and thus defeat this bill; and then that an investigation be made of Booker T. Washington Memorial Foundation and Dr. Phillips. Find out who owns the land, and see just what is back of this whole thing and who is involved in this.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman realizes full well that the Veterans' Administration, ever since its inception, has fought the building of hospital after hospital. The gentleman knows that full well?

Mr. POWELL. I will tell you one thing, I think it is a very good idea right now not to build any hospitals until we find doctors and nurses to take care of the 1,000 empty beds in our hospitals at this moment.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think if we could secure this hospital, it would mean added nurses and doctors.

Mr. POWELL. I do not know how that could happen when we cannot get them now. Members of this body are being asked to waste \$5,000,000 of the taxpayers' money on a foolish scheme to build a hospital for colored veterans. This proposal is merely another attempt to saddle a program of racial segregation on the Federal Government. I hope every Member of this body will realize that a vote for H. R. 314 is a vote for racial segregation of wounded veterans.

It is proposed that this hospital, commonly called a memorial to Booker T. Washington, be located in an isolated area of the State of Virginia. Not only would this be inconvenient for any veterans who had the misfortune of being sent there, but it would also be a severe strain on their relatives and friends who might wish to visit them.

At present the Veterans' Administration has a program aimed at locating hospitals in or near areas where the best medical knowledge, skill, and equipment will be easily available. This

bill would reverse that program and send hundreds of veterans to a segregated area where some of them might die because they could not get the medical advantages given in or near large urban centers.

I would like to know just who will get the most benefit out of this proposition. I would like to know who owns the land that the Government must purchase in order to erect this hospital. What will happen to real estate values in the area when this jim-crow monument is built and who will profit from the rise in those real estate values?

Geographically this hospital would be located in a spot which is just about in the middle of the area covered by Maryland, the District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, and North Carolina.

There are at present nearly 8,779 hospital beds for veterans in this geographic area. At present 2,259 new beds are being made available. There are 998 empty beds and no staff available. Colored veterans have every right to be admitted to these hospital beds. At present they are admitted. If the gentleman from Mississippi wants to perform a real service for veterans, he should try to see that the existing institutions have every penny that we can allocate to make them the best in the world. Instead of pouring \$5,000,000 down the rat-hole of segregation, let us make certain that much-needed equipment and other necessities are given to the hospitals now operating, as well as to those that will soon be built.

If it is the intention of the sponsor of this bill to honor the memory of some outstanding colored person, I suggest that this be done by naming one of the hospitals now under construction for Frederick Douglass, Dr. George W. Carver, Crispus Attucks, or any of the great citizens who have made contributions to the growth of this Nation. Let it also be clear that, although such an institution would carry the name of one of these citizens, it would be open to all veterans without regard to race, religion, or national ancestry.

H. R. 314 cannot be amended in any way that will make it acceptable to those who believe that all citizens of the United States are entitled to be treated as equals.

We would make a tragic mistake if we passed this bill. It would open the door for any group of schemers to come to Congress for appropriations and funds with which to carry out their wasteful plans.

Finally, let me say that I have received a communication from 27 organizations vitally interested in civil rights in the United States. All of them ask that H. R. 314 be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, I have had a great many conferences with these Negroes who are advocating this hospital. They represent the Negroes of the South. These attacks on this hospital do not come from the South, nor have I heard of any protest from the southern Negroes against it. All this charge against Portia Washington Pitt-

man, who is the daughter of old Booker T. Washington, a well-behaved person, who comes here and urges us to build this hospital on ground that is owned by the Booker T. Washington Foundation. The Booker T. Washington Foundation does not promote communism. Get that? The Booker T. Washington Foundation does not advocate communism, as some of these other alleged organizations do, but they are trying to do something for their own people. Portia Washington made this statement. I think it is in the record, but I know she made it in my presence as chairman of the committee. She said, "My father always tried to teach the Negroes how to take care of themselves."

I have never heard of Negroes going to New York to ask a Member from that State what they should do for themselves. If the Negroes of the South are going to be punished by such arguments and such attitude, it means shutting the door of hope in their faces, so far as being able to take care of themselves is concerned. Yes; we have Negroes in all these veterans' hospitals. We have separate wards for them. In the South we take care of the Negroes better than anywhere else in the world. We do not need anybody from New York coming down there to stir up race trouble to tell us what to do. The southern Negroes do not want them, either.

Now, you are either going to vote for this bill or shut the door of hope in the face of these Negroes who want this hospital in order that their doctors may practice there and show what they are able to do.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it a fact that the money that the gentleman seeks in this bill is northern money as well as southern money?

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, of course, it is the whole country. A great deal of it comes from the South. The real power behind the opposition is a Communist-infested organization known as the Association for the Advancement of the Colored People.

I hope this motion is voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the motion to strike out the enacting clause.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 136, noes 57.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order; the gentleman cannot make that motion in the Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote discloses that a quorum is present. The Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. PHILBIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consider-

ation the bill (H. R. 314) to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va., directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 223, nays 117, answered "present" 1, not voting 91, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

YEAS—223

Aandahl	Furcolo	Mason
Adair	Gamble	Meader
Addonizio	Garmatz	Miller, Nebr.
Allen, Calif.	Gavin	Mitchell
Allen, Ill.	George	Morgan
Andersen,	Goodwin	Multer
H. Carl	Gordon	Mumma
Andresen,	Graham	Murphy
August H.	Granahan	Norblad
Anfuso	Greenwood	O'Brien, Ill.
Aspinall	Gross	O'Brien, Mich.
Auchincloss	Hagen	O'Neill
Bailey	Hale	Ostertag
Bakewell	Hall	O'Toole
Baring	Edwin Arthur	Perkins
Barrett	Hall	Philbin
Beall	Leonard W.	Phillips
Beamer	Halleck	Potter
Belcher	Hand	Powell
Bender	Harden	Price
Bennett, Mich.	Hart	Quinn
Berry	Harvey	Radwan
Bishop	Havenner	Reams
Boggs, Del.	Hays, Ohio	Reece, Tenn.
Bolling	Hedrick	Reed, N. Y.
Bolton	Heffernan	Rees, Kans.
Bray	Heller	Rhodes
Breen	Heseltan	Ribicoff
Budge	Hess	Riehlman
Buffett	Hill	Rodino
Burdick	Hillings	Rogers, Colo.
Burnside	Hoeven	Rooney
Bush	Hollfield	Sadlak
Butler	Holmes	St. George
Byrnes, Wis.	Hope	Sasser
Canfield	Horan	Saylor
Cannon	Howell	Scott
Case	Hunter	Hugh D., Jr.
Celler	Jackson, Calif.	Scrivner
Chatham	Jackson, Wash.	Scudder
Chiperfield	James	Secrest
Church	Javits	Seely-Brown
Cole, Kans.	Jonson	Shelley
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson	Sheppard
Cottont	Jonas	Sieminski
Crosser	Judd	Simpson, Ill.
Crumpacker	Karsten, Mo.	Simpson, Pa.
Cunningham	Kean	Sittler
Curtis, Mo.	Kearney	Springer
Curtis, Nebr.	Keating	Stefan
Dague	Keogh	Taber
Davis, Wis.	Kersten, Wis.	Talle
Dawson	King	Thomas
Deane	Kirwan	Thompson,
Denny	Klein	Mich.
Denton	Kluczynski	Tollefson
Devereux	Lane	Towe
D'Ewart	Latham	Van Pelt
Dollinger	Lesinski	Van Zandt
Dolliver	Lind	Vaughn
Dondero	Lovre	Vorys
Donohue	McConnell	Walter
Donovan	McCormack	Welch
Doyle	McCulloch	Wharton
Eaton	McDonough	Whitaker
Eberharter	McGrath	Whitall
Elston	McGregor	Wier
Engle	McGuire	Williams, N. Y.
Fallon	McKinnon	Wolcott
Feighan	McVey	Wolverton
Fenton	Machrowicz	Woodruff
Fernandez	Mack, Wash.	Yates
Fine	Madden	Yorty
Fogarty	Mansfield	Zablocki
Ford	Marshall	
Fulton	Martin, Iowa	
	Martin, Mass.	

NAYS—117

Abbitt	Fellows	Patman
Abernethy	Fisher	Pickett
Albert	Forrester	Preston
Allen, La.	Frazier	Priest
Anderson, Calif.	Gathings	Rains
Andrews	Golden	Rankin
Armstrong	Gore	Redden
Ayres	Gossett	Riley
Bates, Ky.	Grant	Roberts
Battle	Gregory	Robeson
Beckworth	Hardy	Rogers, Mass.
Bennett, Fla.	Harris	Rogers, Tex.
Bentsen	Harrison, Va.	Schwabe
Betts	Hull	Shaffer
Blackney	Jarman	Short
Bow	Jenkins	Sikes
Bramblett	Jensen	Smith, Miss.
Brehm	Jones, Ala.	Smith, Va.
Brooks	Jones,	Smith, Wis.
Brown, Ga.	Hamilton C.	Spence
Brown, Ohio	Jones,	Steed
Bryson	Woodrow W.	Stigler
Burleson	Kerr	Stockman
Burton	Lantaff	Sutton
Busbey	Larcade	Tackett
Camp	Lucas	Thompson, Tex.
Carlyle	McMillan	Thornberry
Chelf	McMullen	Trimble
Chenoweth	Magee	Vall
Clevenger	Mahon	Velde
Colmer	Miller, Md.	Watts
Combs	Mills	Werdel
Cooper	Morris	Wheeler
Cox	Morrison	Whitten
Davis, Ga.	Morton	Wickersham
Davis, Tenn.	Murray, Tenn.	Williams, Miss.
DeGraffenried	Nicholson	Wilson, Tex.
Doughton	Norrell	Withrow
Elliott	O'Hara	Wood, Idaho
Ellsworth	Passman	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Rogers, Fla.

NOT VOTING—91

Angell	Green	O'Konski
Arends	Gwinn	Patten
Baker	Harrison, Wyo.	Patterson
Barden	Hays, Ark.	Poage
Bates, Mass.	Hébert	Polk
Blatnik	Herlong	Poulson
Boggs, La.	Herter	Prouty
Bonner	Hinshaw	Rabaut
Bosone	Hoffman, Ill.	Ramsay
Boykin	Hoffman, Mich.	Reed, Ill.
Brownson	Irving	Regan
Buckley	Jones, Mo.	Richards
Byrne, N. Y.	Kearns	Rivers
Carnahan	Kelley, Pa.	Roosevelt
Chudoff	Kelly, N. Y.	Sabath
Clemente	Kennedy	Scott, Hardie
Cooley	Kilburn	Sheehan
Coudert	Kilday	Smith, Kans.
Crawford	Lanham	Staggers
Delaney	LeCompte	Stanley
Dempsey	Lyle	Taylor
Dingell	McCarthy	Teague
Dorn	Mack, Ill.	Vinson
Durham	Morrow	Vursell
Evins	Miller, Calif.	Wigglesworth
Flood	Miller, N. Y.	Willis
Forand	Morano	Wilson, Ind.
Fugate	Moulder	Winstead
Gary	Murdock	Wood, Ga.
Gillette	Murray, Wis.	
Granger	Nelson	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Brownson for, with Mr. Herlong against.

Mr. Herter for, with Mr. Rogers of Florida against.

Mr. Sabath for, with Mr. Winstead against.

Mrs. Kelly of New York for, with Mr. Wood of Georgia against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Bonner against.

Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. Boykin against.

Mr. Kearns for, with Mr. Rivers against.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Richards against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Hays of Arkansas against.

Mr. McCarthy for, with Mr. Teague against.

Mr. Chudoff for, with Mr. Vinson against.
Mr. Flood for, with Mr. Gary against.
Mr. Forand for, with Mr. Fugate against.
Mr. Green for, with Mr. Durham against.
Mr. Rabaut for, with Mr. Dorn against.
Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Cooley against.

Mr. Patten for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Sheehan for, with Mr. Lanham against.

Mr. Granger for, with Mr. Barden against.
Mr. Clemente for, with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana against.

Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Kilday against.
Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Regan against.
Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. Willis against.

Until further notice:

Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Reed of Illinois.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Angell.
Mr. Lyle with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Mack of Illinois with Mr. Harrison of Wyoming.

Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Evins with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Gillette.

Mr. Jones of Missouri with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Irving with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Moulder with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Carnahan with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. Murdock with Mr. Poulson.
Mr. Polk with Mr. Patterson.

Mr. Ramsey with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. HERTER. Had he been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. FERNANDEZ changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. Bow changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CROSSER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. REECE of Tennessee changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a vote for this bill puts the stamp of approval on segregation. No matter how attractive and compelling you make this bill for the erection of a hospital, it still is segregation with a capital "S." Building any hospital for veterans is most laudable. It is damnable when it is for Negro veterans only.

The author and sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from Mississippi, speaks of the project of a "nigger" hospital. The word "nigger," when uttered by the gentleman, has derogatory connotations. His calling it a "nigger" hospital is sufficient to encourage a vote against the bill. Frankly, the appellation "nigger" is abhorrent under any circumstances.

It is cruel to use the name Booker T. Washington to ensnare the unwary. Surely, if he were alive, he would resent any hospital catering only to Negroes and sponsored by the Government. He would not want it named for him. His life and works belie segregation.

The gentleman from Mississippi claims that Negroes appreciate this recognition. They do not appreciate—in fact, they deprecate—recognition as second-class citizens. Segregation means second-class citizenship. They are entitled to equality in case of hospitalization—equality in sickness and health.

No. I shall emphatically vote against this bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the Members' attention the position of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, as expressed by Clarence Mitchell, director of the Washington bureau, in the following letter:

I take this opportunity to send to you a communication urging that every effort be made to defeat H. R. 314. This bill proposes to use \$5,000,000 of Federal money for the building of a hospital at Booker T. Washington's birthplace in Franklin County, Va.

Because a great many people who wish to honor Mr. Washington's memory may think that this is the way of doing it, I hope that you will explain on the floor of Congress that this is one of worst possible ways of discriminating against colored veterans.

We have carefully canvassed the present available bed space for veterans in Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, and the District of Columbia. There are 10,438 beds authorized for veterans in the hospitals of these States and the District. We are advised that 9,460 beds are actually in use but nearly 1,000 others cannot be used because of a shortage of trained personnel and for other reasons. Hence, as a matter of giving the best service to veterans, the money might be more wisely spent in doing every possible thing to see that present hospital facilities and the buildings now in existence or under consideration operate at maximum efficiency.

During my conversations with some of the Members of Congress, I have been told that they were under the impression that the hospital would provide additional facilities for colored people, and, therefore, they thought it was a good thing. We hope very much that you will point out that the NAACP maintains a constant watch on the treatment of veterans in various hospitals' facilities. There are occasions when attempts are made to discriminate against colored veterans but we always seek and obtain correction of such discrimination. We believe that any public institution, and most especially a hospital, should be open to all people without regard to race.

The Veterans' Administration has not always moved as rapidly on these matters as we hoped but there is a definite trend in the right direction which most certainly would be reversed if there is an appropriation for a hospital for colored veterans.

One alternative that has been suggested in this legislation appears to resolve the problem on the surface but actually would not accomplish anything. It has been suggested by some that the hospital be built with the understanding that it will be available to all persons without regard to race or creed. In actual practice, of course, no white persons would be sent to this hospital because of its bad location.

One Member of Congress recently informed me that the Veterans' Administration placed a new hospital site in Baltimore rather than Cumberland, Md., because the latter city was not close enough to a large medical center. Franklin County, Virginia, is even more remote from such medical centers than Cumberland. Hence, a hospital placed there would be a serious threat to the physical well-being of veterans unfortunate enough to be sent to it.

Aside from the basic issue of class legislation, there is the further point of economy and proper use of Federal funds. There is considerable question as to whether there is an actual need for this hospital and certainly there has been no well-founded assertion that there is an emergency.

There is no question that the proposed Booker T. Washington Memorial Veterans Hospital would provide certain benefits to certain of our citizens.

As a matter of fact, any person can sit down and figure out things to do which would produce certain benefits for certain of our citizens.

The question before this House now and constantly before the House in these times is whether these proposals are in the interest of the over-all welfare of our citizens.

It has been stated, by cynics, I believe, that the people, if given the power of self-government, would bankrupt their government by constantly going to the Treasury for the means to finance their immediate desires.

Until a few years ago this cynical observation had little basis for support. The integrity of the American people was such that they preferred to defer immediate benefits to themselves in the belief that such denial would redound to the benefit of their children. Furthermore, they had faith the economic system of free enterprise would bring about these desired things with patience and hard work.

There has been a change in the past two decades. The Treasury is being raided every day for worth-while enterprises. Each person seems to be outdoing the other to figure out new worth-while projects we might embark upon. Those who oppose the expenditure of governmental funds for these projects are branded as being antisocial and opposed to the purposes of the project itself.

So it has become that those who are most concerned with the people's welfare are pictured as being opposed to it, and those who in their short-sighted way are in effect undermining the future prospects of our children, are pictured as being imbued with all the fine qualities of love for their fellow man.

However, I have more faith in the American people than apparently do some. I am impressed with the government of the State of Utah refusing Federal funds, a city in Illinois refusing a new post office, Congressmen on the floor of this House refusing special funds for projects in their own district, and similar indications of a broader viewpoint.

I am unimpressed with those colleagues of mine who speak on the floor in favor

of economy on projects which do not affect their districts and yet who cry out, "It is such a relatively small amount of money" when it involves expenditures for projects within their district.

The greatest thing that any of us can do for our people today and for our children tomorrow is to start hacking away at the tremendous Federal debt we have piled up. This is the greatest thing we can do for our people today because herein lies the basic cause of inflation which has badly affected our standard of living and threatens our future. It is the greatest thing we can do for our children because we have no right to place such a mortgage upon them, we who inherited not a debt, but a handsome bank balance from our predecessors.

Economy must begin at home. For me it begins in the Twelfth District of Missouri. I told my people that when I was campaigning for election, I have reiterated it time and again. I restate it now. I want no person or group from the Twelfth District of Missouri writing me or seeing me about projects to spend money in that district. It will do no good. I will oppose it. In return, I expect similar pledges from my colleagues down here.

The talk is of economy, but there is little practice of it. Federal funds to the free-enterprise system is like dope. It has very valuable medicinal values but abused it can produce tragic addicts. The dope peddlers are not friends of the dope addict though the addict may seek the peddler out and cry to high heaven if his source is cut off.

I say it is high time to call the peddlers of Federal funds for what they are. Their interest is not the welfare of the people.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. R. 314, a bill for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans in Franklin County, Va., at a cost of \$5,000,000. I have consistently favored the establishment and maintenance of all necessary facilities for the care of veterans and had the efforts on the part of Members from the Pennsylvania area been followed in connection with the Valley Forge Hospital much of the expense of its premature closing and subsequent reopening and refurbishing with new equipment could have been avoided.

The proposal to establish this hospital is unwarranted because no need for it has been shown. Furthermore, this bill is opposed by the Veterans' Administration as proposing to set up a hospital in a remote and isolated area where facilities for treatment cannot fail to be restricted and inadequate.

I now come to the best and strongest reason for opposing this bill, and that is its designation as a hospital for Negro veterans. I know of no hospitals which are established for the treatment of white veterans, or French veterans, or Greek veterans or Jewish veterans, or veterans who are also members of Jehovah's Witnesses.

In Korea last fall I saw many seriously wounded veterans coming off the field of

battle and receiving treatment at Army hospitals and aboard Navy hospital ships. Some were white and some were Negro troops, many of the latter from the famous Twenty-fourth Regiment of the Twenty-fifth Division. There was no difference in their courage or their gallantry; there was no difference in the method of treatment they received, or in the character of the wounds treated. There was certainly no complaint on the part of either Negro or white veterans that they were received and treated without segregation in the same hospital wards; nor did I ever hear any complaint from any white or Negro veteran regarding the absence of segregation in the hospitals. If a man is good enough to risk his life for his country his country ought to be big enough to extend to him equal treatment regardless of race, or creed, or color. I am sure that it would be very bad propaganda for us and very good propaganda for Joe Stalin if the Communists abroad were to send out word to the yellow peoples of Asia that white and Negro troops who served together in Korea, were treated together in the same hospitals in Korea, were separated after they returned to the land of the free and the home of the brave and required to receive treatment in hospitals according to the color of their skins. Whenever additional facilities are required for veterans, let them be provided for veterans on the basis of their service, their need, and the national interest and not on the basis of their race, their creed, or their color.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4329) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and, pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN] and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4329, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the consent agreement the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BATES] is entitled to 30 min-

utes and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN] to 30 minutes.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the regular 1952 budget for the District of Columbia for the 1952 fiscal year totaled \$136,778,600. This was amended on May 17, by proposed supplemental appropriations in the amount of \$3,734,550, bringing the total amount of the 1952 budget to \$140,513,150. This total was made up of \$33,339,350 for capital outlay and \$107,173,800 for operating expenses. Of the total amount requested \$3,841,260 was not requested to become available for expenditure until fiscal year 1953, leaving \$136,671,890 requested for expenditure during fiscal year 1952. The revenues were estimated to total \$139,338,012 which would provide a gross surplus of \$2,666,122 over the amount requested. However, the Commissioners estimated \$2,250,000 to be a necessary reserve for supplemental and deficiency appropriations for such activities as civilian defense and control of rent ceilings for which no budget estimates were submitted pending additional legislation.

The budget submitted by the District was based upon a Federal appropriation of \$11,000,000 to the general fund and \$1,000,000 to the water fund as provided by Public Law 195, Eightieth Congress, first session. Testimony which we heard on this item has thoroughly convinced me and I believe also the other members of the committee that this is the minimum amount which should be appropriated. It was brought out in the hearings that, if taxed, Federal property would produce approximately \$18,000,000. To me this item alone is ample justification of the amount requested. It was also pointed out that the water furnished Federal agencies would cost \$1,200,000 if paid for at the rates charged other users in the District. Thus, the \$1,000,000 requested to be appropriated to the water fund is \$200,000 short of a sufficient amount to reimburse the District at current water rates. These are only two of the very many items of expense which fall upon the District because of the activities of the Federal Government at the city of Washington.

The request of \$33,339,350 for capital outlay items compares with the total granted in 1951 including contract authority of \$31,507,575. Of course, there is no contract authority included in the 1952 bill. Thus, the budget for 1952 would provide for an increase, over 1951, of \$1,831,775. Since the cost of construction has increased at least 15 percent during the last year the budget would have provided for slightly less actual construction than was provided by the 1951 appropriations. The committee was favorably impressed with the capital outlay program which was presented to it. It appeared to have been rather well planned for the regular budget submission and after that submission the Commissioners again reviewed this program and in the light of increased costs, revised it to bring it up to date. In revising it they deleted cer-

tain projects which were lowest on the priority list in order to provide funds for the increased cost of completing other projects already started or of higher priority. With relatively minor exceptions the committee has approved the capital outlay program. The reductions recommended by the committee total \$441,000.

The District's budget request of \$107,173,800 for operating expenses represented a total increase of \$5,994,023 over the amount available for this purpose in 1951. This increase was made up of over \$3,500,000 for items of expense over which the District has little or no control such as in-grade promotions, the District of Columbia's share of the cost of United States courts, reimbursement to St. Elizabeths Hospital, increased cost of electricity, and increases in retirement fund requirements which are actuarially computed. Approximately \$2,400,000 of the increase requested for operating expenses was for new positions and expansion of other administrative facilities. The committee did not feel that most of the requested increases for expansion of administrative facilities were justified. The committee has, therefore, reduced the budget request by \$2,295,775 which represents a net reduction, in considering the budget as a whole, of over 90 percent in the funds requested for additional personnel and expansion of other administrative facilities.

ATHLETIC PROGRAM IN THE PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS

The present procedure, under which the athletic program of the public high schools is operated, is for each school to finance its own program. Naturally the income from athletic events varies considerably between schools with the result that some schools are able to carry out a fairly adequate program whereas other schools are not able to provide the essentials for a minimum program. I have had reports that in some cases the lack of funds for uniforms and protective equipment has made participation in athletics actually hazardous.

The change we have recommended in this appropriation item will provide for an equalization of these inequities so that pupils in one school will not be penalized just because they happen to live in a neighborhood that is poor. The centralization of purchasing will also enable the schools to get more per dollar since it will enable them to take advantage of discounts available when equipment is purchased in large quantities.

I am very strongly of the opinion that the benefits to the community will far outweigh the small expense of this program.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Would the gentleman tell the House—I believe he did touch on it slightly—just how much more money is contained in this bill, that is, actual working money, above contract authorizations, and such? How much money is contained in this bill over and

above what was available for the present fiscal year, 1951?

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. My recollection is one-million-eight-hundred-thousand-odd dollars.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. How does the gentleman reconcile that with the report on page 25, the column headed "Bill compared with 1951 appropriations" which shows that there is \$17,000,000 more in this bill than was available in 1951?

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. If you will look through the report you will find contract authorizations made last year.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. And was that all taken care of?

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The difference is accounted for by that.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. That is right.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia dealing with appropriations, I think, has worked in splendid harmony this year. I think this was due principally to the fine chairmanship and leadership given the committee by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BATES] and the fine spirit of cooperation shown by all the members of the committee. It was quite a little chore to go through this entire bill. You all know that due to increased costs of all commodities the budget for the District is considerably higher this year than it has been in the past. We tried to keep things down as much as we could and yet not curb or cripple any of the necessary activities of the District. I think the committee performed a very fine job in this respect.

One of the major points in controversy in the committee was an amount of \$275,000 requested for the purchase of the equipment of the municipal golf courses of the District. There was considerable debate and discussion on this point, but it was unanimously agreed by the committee that the amount should be denied, which it was. As a result, the committee recommends to the House that the golf courses be left under the private management under which they are now operated.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, as the House is now engaged in general debate and remarks on any subject are in order, I will digress for a moment to discuss a subject of perhaps no less immediate interest and importance.

That incomparable premier of all columnists and broadcasters, Mr. Drew Pearson, "whose predictions have proven 88 percent correct," announces that on Sunday next he will broadcast his prediction on President Truman's candidacy in 1952. He will tell the Nation next Sunday evening whether President Truman will be a candidate for the Pres-

idency or whether he will retire from public life at the close of his present term.

Mr. Chairman, I propose to beat Mr. Pearson to the draw. Mr. Pearson defers his broadcast until next week. I will go Mr. Pearson one better by not only predicting the President's course in the next election but by also predicting today what Mr. Pearson will predict next Sunday.

Now I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet. All I know is what I read in the newspapers. But that is all Mr. Pearson knows. He will be governed in his prediction by the inevitable, unavoidable, deducible logic of the situation. I likewise will be governed by cold reason, by the infallible, ineluctable, inescapable sequence of the rapidly moving events which have brought us down to this moment—predestined and fore-ordained.

Naturally Mr. Pearson and I reach the same conclusion—that President Truman will be a candidate and that he will be renominated at the Democratic National Convention at Chicago in 1952.

What else could be asked or expected? Already it is apparent that the success of his foreign policy is assured. He has given the American people the one thing they most desire above all others—freedom from world war III.

At the beginning of this session of Congress it was a toss-up as to when world war III would start, with the chances shaded in favor of war. There were many in a position to judge who thought a general war this year was inevitable. And with that in mind, every war plant in the Nation was geared to top production.

Every day it becomes increasingly certain that President Truman has avoided a third world war, for this year, at least, with every prospect of pushing a general war further and further into the background until it is no longer a probability and eventually no longer a possibility.

He has held Korea. It was freely predicted a short time ago that our forces there would have to withdraw or be driven into the sea. Against overwhelming odds, under every disadvantage, we have destroyed every division sent against us. With the support and cooperation of gallant allies, we have held Korea. Already conditions there are being stabilized. By retaining the fighting to Korea and preventing its spread to Asia and Europe, we have been saved from fighting a war on our own doorstep.

Someone asks, "What about the boys who have died in Korea?"

Boys died at Bunker Hill and Valley Forge. But they created a nation. Boys died at Chateau Thierry and Guadalcanal. But they saved a world. An Unknown Soldier lies in glory at Arlington and his mother weeps uncomfited. Do you say he died in vain? Do you say these men who died so heroically last month across the sea died in vain? They saved the untold millions who will die if world war III must be fought, and

the wreckage of the thousand cities which will fall here in the homeland if world war III must be fought. They died to save a nation and a civilization.

President Truman has confined the fighting to Korea. He has pushed back world war III. He has advanced the prestige of American arms throughout the world. He has inculcated in an implacable foe a wholesome respect for American valor and power. He has given notice to the world, in a language no one can misunderstand, that America keeps her obligations and honors her treaties. He has confounded our enemies and reassured our friends. He has wrecked the plans of communism and totalitarian autocracy for world conquest and has rallied the wavering hope of a distraught world for permanent peace.

Not only has he given the Nation what we most desire, freedom from world war III, but he has given us unprecedented prosperity. He has given us the highest standard of living, the largest income, we have ever enjoyed. Every family in America is living better today than they ever lived before. Everybody has a job. Employment is at the all-time peak and at the highest wages ever known. Our factories are pouring out a record flood of goods, luxuries as well as necessities. And while the standard of living is rising, the cost of living is falling, and price wars in every city are forcing down prices and increasing the purchasing power of the dollar.

President Truman is winning the war against communism. Only a year ago communism was an imminent threat in every country on the globe. He has united the nations against the common enemy. The threat is losing in every free election. And here in the United States communism was never so impotent.

He has balanced the budget. Original estimates by the Treasury indicated a deficit of \$2,700,000,000 by the close of the fiscal year. Today the estimates show instead a probable surplus of \$3,000,000,000. The conference report on the last appropriation bill agreed to here in the House shows the greatest reduction in departmental estimates in the history of the American Congress.

The President's administration opened with bitter conflict in prospect between labor and management, and a prospective drop below parity in farm income. Today, labor and management, in complete cooperation, and American agriculture in enjoyment of a full parity price for every farm product, are giving the people of the United States the greatest prosperity ever earned by any people, of any land, in any period in all the annals of time.

Let me repeat the statement made here on the floor a few weeks ago. Judged by any criterion of national safety or national prosperity, by any yardstick of accomplishment, or statesmanship, President Truman ranks today, and will rank in history, as one of the greatest Presidents to occupy that exalted position.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT].

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, no doubt every Member of the House, like myself, has had a number of communications from the merchants in his district regarding the difficulties confronting those merchants in complying with the OPS regulations.

There is in my district a young man in the hardware business whose name is Jap Lucas, a self-made man. From time to time Mr. Lucas has made efforts to present the difficulties of the small-business man to the Congress through the proper congressional committee. Unfortunately circumstances have prevented that. However, Mr. Lucas at his own expense, and on his own initiative, has made arrangements whereby the Congress can be advised first hand of the difficulties a small-business man is now encountering in complying with the OPS regulations.

I would like to call attention to the fact that on tonight, at 8:30 p. m., daylight saving time, over radio station WOL, Washington, D. C., Mr. Lucas will speak for a number of minutes at his own expense, advising you and the country of the situation as he sees it. That speech will be repeated on Thursday, June 7, at 8:30 p. m., daylight saving time. Your courteous attention is asked to Mr. Lucas' remarks, which will be timely and no doubt pungent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] has expired.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER].

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask the indulgence of the House to speak out of order.

I wish I had the crystal ball that our friend from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] possesses, to look into the future to predict what Republican candidate for President we may have in 1952. But I am quite confident that whatever candidate we may select out of the vast field of capable statesmen, there will be little difficulty in disposing of the gentleman from Missouri, President Truman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I asked the gentleman to yield for the reason I know the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD does not always give a true picture of that which goes on in the House. Perhaps it should be pointed out that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is one of the great humorists of the House. He has long been known for his jolly smile and

for the clever things he so often says in jest. Those of us present today are sure the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] was jesting when he suggested that both he and Mr. Pearson gaze into the same crystal ball. I might add that if future events should happen to prove the gentleman from Missouri to be wrong in his prediction as to who will be nominated and elected president, the fur coat and deep freeze trade of this country is going to be ruined.

Mr. POTTER. I am sure the gentleman's observation is true.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POTTER. I prefer not to. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] found it very difficult to yield to the members on our side.

The people who know the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] can all appreciate the humortone and the humorous vein in which he gave his remarks. I thought the gentleman's remarks about how the President kept us out of war were a little far afield. It seems to me I recall reading in the paper—it might have been Drew Pearson's column—that we have about 150,000 casualties from Korea. I am certain that those men would be inclined to disagree with the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] when he takes great pride and pleasure in pointing out that our President has kept us from war.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Do you think the gentleman from Missouri would have any success in trying to convince the parents of those 150,000 casualties, a large portion of whom are dead or missing in action, that we are not currently engaged in a very bitter war in Korea?

Mr. POTTER. I am sure it would be a most difficult thing to do.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield briefly.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I wonder if the gentleman would not like to ask the distinguished gentleman who just spoke in regard to his remark that the war was confined to Korea by the President personally, let us say. If he will consult the ones fighting over there, I think he would find that they would rather go ahead and win that war and get it over with, than to carry on this stalemate.

Mr. POTTER. I think probably the gentleman from Missouri would find time to answer the gentleman's question.

The reason that I asked for this time today was not to get into a political discussion. But I do want to bring to the attention of the House a matter which is of vital importance to us in the great State of Michigan, and I think also to the country.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Un-American Activities, of which I am privileged to be a member, has been conducting extensive hearings on the extent of

Communist infiltration in the motion-picture industry. The hearings conducted this year are a continuation of those which began in 1947 when the much publicized Hollywood Ten were cited for contempt.

I believe that the hearings conducted under our able chairman, Judge Woon, of Georgia, have provided the Congress and the country with valuable information concerning activities of the Communist Party in the motion-picture industry.

It is established without doubt that the Communist Party carried on an extensive campaign to gain control of this vital industry. Its purposes for concentrating on the motion-picture industry are threefold: First, to obtain funds for the party. Here was a reservoir of highly paid individuals who could and did contribute millions of dollars into the coffers of the Communist Party. I am convinced that Hollywood was a major source of revenue for the party in the United States.

Secondly, the Communists were desirous of securing so-called big names or public names in their organization for prestige purposes.

The third and ultimate objective of the Communist Party's activities in Hollywood was to gain control of the various guilds in order to utilize motion pictures as a means of spreading Communist propaganda.

I believe that the present hearings have been more revealing than the hearings of 1947. Many individuals who have broken away from the Communist Party are cooperating with the committee, informing us of their activities while they were members of Communist cells in Hollywood. The committee has received a great deal of valuable information from the testimony of former Communists such as directors Dmytryk and Tuttle, writers Richard Collins and Strongberg, and actor Sterling Hayden.

Witnesses who have appeared before the committee can be generally classified into three categories: First, there are the ex-members of the Communist Party who have given us the benefit of their vast knowledge concerning the activities of members of the Communist Party with whom they were associated. We refer to these as the "cooperating witnesses."

Another group are those who have been subpoenaed and when they appear before us refuse to cooperate and hide behind the fifth amendment to our Constitution. These are referred to as "unfriendly witnesses." I think it significant to point out that anyone who hides behind the fifth amendment, who in answer to the question as to whether he was or had been a member of the Communist Party, refuses to answer because his reply might tend to incriminate him, leaves the committee with only one choice: to believe that he is a member of the Communist Party. If he were not a member or had not been a member, certainly a truthful answer would not incriminate him and there would be no

purpose in seeking the protection of the fifth amendment.

Another type are persons we call the tight rope-walking witnesses, who claim they are not members of the Communist Party and have never been members. They explain that they have joined various front organizations without knowing the purposes of the organization or that their names were used without their knowledge. These witnesses put on an act of being extremely naive. The committee can only bring out available evidence, and it is up to the public to determine whether they should give credence to the testimony of these witnesses.

Of course, we always have those people on whom we have attempted to serve subpoenas and who willfully dodge the officers by leaving the country or otherwise being unavailable, or who secure medical statements to the effect that they are in such ill health that they are not able to appear before the committee.

A case in mind is actor J. Edward Bromberg, who was issued a subpoena some time in March 1951, and through his attorney, Mr. Popper, submitted a letter to our committee accompanied by a medical statement, which I will read.

A subpoena was served on J. Edward Bromberg, who was an actor, in March of this year.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman said a subpoena was served; I think the fact is that the subpoena was issued.

Mr. POTTER. The subpoena was served him. His attorney said that Mr. Bromberg would be unable to appear before the committee and he cited two certificates from doctors as to his heart condition. I insert a copy of the attorney's letter and the certificates from the doctors:

LAW OFFICES, WOLF, POPPER,
ROSS & WOLF,
New York, N. Y., April 6, 1951.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

(Attention Frank Tavenner, Esquire.)

DEAR SIR: I am the attorney for Mr. J. Edward Bromberg, who has been subpoenaed to appear before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on April 12, 1951. As I indicated to you on the telephone on Thursday, April 5, I shall make a formal application to the committee to vacate the subpoena served upon Mr. Bromberg on the basis of his physical condition.

I am enclosing for the information of the committee, medical certificates from two heart specialists which describe Mr. Bromberg's condition and indicate that if he is compelled to appear before the committee he may suffer an attack of heart failure. I also have in my possession and will make available to the committee electrocardiographs taken on March 19, 1951, by William I. Geffer, M. D., one of the heart specialists whose certificate is enclosed.

In accordance with our telephone conversation, I should appreciate it very much if

you would arrange for me to appear before the committee on April 10, 1951, to make the application to vacate Mr. Bromberg's subpoena.

Very truly yours,
WOLF, POPPER, ROSS & WOLF,
By MARTIN POPPER.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., March 20, 1951.

WALTER MODELL, M. D.,
New York, N. Y.

Re: Mr. Edward Bromberg.

DEAR DR. MODELL: This is to inform you briefly of the progress of your patient, Mr. J. Edward Bromberg.

I saw him on March 12, 1951, at which time he was in moderate congestive heart failure. His heart rate was about 100 and regular. A gallop rhythm was present. There was bilateral pulmonary congestion about one-half way up the chest posteriorly. His neck veins were prominent and his liver was engorged and tender. He had slight ankle edema. His blood pressure was 160/90. I gave him 2 cubic centimeters of a mercurial diuretic intramuscularly and asked him to take 1.2 milligrams of digitoxin over the next 24 hours and then 0.2 milligram daily. I urged his salt restriction. He was remarkably improved on March 14, 1951. There was no evidence of congestive failure except for slight hepatic enlargement. His ventricular rate was 70 and his blood pressure 110/70. At this time I was able to distinguish his heart sounds clearly. As you of course know, he has aortic regurgitation and mitral stenosis. He has been receiving a mercurial diuretic every few days. On March 16, 1951, he called and complained about substernal discomfort after walking several blocks. He came to the office and I found slight basal congestion. The pain was no longer present. An electrocardiogram showed no evidence of a recent myocardial infarction. I reduced his digitoxin dosage to 0.1 milligram daily. On March 19, 1951, he complained of having had several episodes of precordial distress, not related to exertion however. The location of the discomfort, and the characteristics of the pain, strongly suggested the picture of clinical coronary insufficiency. An electrocardiogram again taken (see enclosed) was identical with the one taken previously. I advised Mr. Bromberg to try nitroglycerin sublingually in order to determine whether the precordial pain could be relieved promptly.

I will advise you further concerning his future progress.

Very truly yours,
WILLIAM I. GEFFER, M. D.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 1, 1951.

MR. MARTIN POPPER,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. POPPER: Mr. J. Edward Bromberg has asked me to write to you.

Mr. Bromberg has rheumatic heart disease. He first visited me because of this in August 1944 and since he has taken residence in this city I have attended him regularly for it.

Mr. Bromberg discovered that he had rheumatic heart disease in his youth, but the exact time it developed has not been established. Since its discovery, and until recently, his heart disease has been well compensated and he has required no treatment. Since December 1950 he has complained of symptoms of cardiac dysfunction. This was treated with mercurial diuretics, with relief. In March 1951, in Philadelphia he suffered a frank attack of congestive failure. This was treated with digitalis and mercurial diuretics. This form of treatment has been continued, and Mr. Bromberg is now symptom free.

Treatment and dietary restriction will be required for an indefinite period. I have also advised Mr. Bromberg to refrain from emotional upsets, and to avoid tensions and anxieties. There is the possibility that unless this plan is followed that there will be further attacks of heart failure.

Very truly yours,
WALTER MODELL, M. D.

Now it is interesting to note that although Mr. Bromberg's health does not permit him to appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities, he is at the present time staying at the Michigan League Building in Ann Arbor, Mich., rehearsing for a play, The Royal Family, in which he will make seven appearances in 5 days the middle of this month. Apparently his health is sufficiently improved since he begged off from appearing before our committee to allow him to carry on this most strenuous week. I think it wise at this point to cite from the public record a little bit about this man Bromberg.

During the public hearings before our committee on April 24, 1951, Marc Lawrence, a motion-picture actor, testified that during 1938 he attended about 12 Communist cell meetings and that J. Edward Bromberg was in the same cell with him. On May 24, 1951, Frank Wright Tuttle, a director in the motion-picture industry, testified before our Committee on Un-American Activities that he, Tuttle, had been a member of the Communist Party from 1937 to 1947, during which time he belonged to perhaps five different Communist groups. Mr. Tuttle further testified that J. E. Bromberg, an actor, was in one of the Communist Party groups with him.

I would like to quote some excerpts from the files of the committee, citing the long background in Communist and Communist-front activities carried on by actor Bromberg:

The Communist Daily Worker reported on November 6, 1933 (p. 2), "the League of Professional Groups, * * * signed a statement urging support of the Communist Party platform and candidates in tomorrow's election. * * * Among the signers were: * * * J. Edward Bromberg, the Group Theater.

Bromberg has a Communist record a mile long, dating back to 1933 when the Communist Daily Worker on November 6, 1933, wrote that the League of Professional Groups signed a statement urging support of the Communist Party platform and candidates in tomorrow's election, and among the signers were J. Edward Bromberg, of the Group Theater.

He has been identified with the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, which is a Communist-front organization; the Hollywood Chapter of the League of American Writers, which has been under the auspices of the Communist Party. He taught for the New Theater League, cited as a Communist-front organization. He was active on behalf of the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners and other Communist-front organizations.

In September 1939, 1 month after the signing of the Nazi-Soviet pact, a group of Communist Party stooges issued an open letter bearing the title "Open Letter for Closer Cooperation With the Soviet Union." It should be emphasized that the United States and the Soviet Union were not at that time collaborating against the Axis Powers; on the contrary, the Soviet Union was collaborating with the Nazis.

This activity on behalf of the Soviet Union during this period of time shows a well-disciplined Communist.

He was also active in the Jewish People's Fraternal Order, which was cited as a Communist-front organization by former Attorney General Tom Clark.

He was active in the Civil Rights Congress, also cited by the Attorney General as a Communist-front organization.

J. Edward Bromberg, identified as an actor, sent a petition to the Supreme Court of the United States for a reconsideration of its refusal to hear the appeal of the Hollywood 10. This was shown in an advertisement inserted in the Washington Post of May 24, 1950.

This gives a thumbnail sketch of the long Communist background of J. Edward Bromberg.

I have contacted the University of Michigan with regard to Bromberg's appearance there and am advised that The Royal Family is produced under the auspices of the Ann Arbor drama series. This series is sponsored by a committee of approximately nine members and has no official connection with the University of Michigan. However, I understand that six members of the staff of the university are on the committee.

Apparently the committee contacted a casting office in New York to secure talent and this talent works with local talent at the university to put on plays such as The Royal Family. The only official connection with the University of Michigan is that the university leases the facilities for conducting the plays. It is to be regretted that the casting office which the Ann Arbor drama series contacted should send them a man of J. Edward Bromberg's reputation. I am afraid that many people will assume that this series has the official blessing of the university and will be very much concerned over the fact that a man of Bromberg's Communist background should appear in a play there.

As the university receives partial support from the taxpayers of Michigan, I think it should be ever diligent in its efforts to make sure that these funds are not used to provide university facilities for a Communist.

In order to save the Ann Arbor drama series committee and the University of Michigan from undue embarrassment, and because we are desirous of having Mr. Bromberg appear before our committee, I have asked our committee to take appropriate action.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I believe our subcommittee has done an able and a conscientious job. Yet, as I review the work of the subcommittee I cannot escape the feeling that ours is a job that should be done by residents of the District of Columbia rather than by Members of Congress from other sections of the United States. I have been on this committee for 3 years now; I have become somewhat familiar with the activities of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, but I feel that even though I have tried to do a conscientious job I do not have the sufficient intimate and basic knowledge of the institutions and the activities of the District to qualify me for the job as well as someone who lived here during the entire year and who worked exclusively on District of Columbia problems. Congressmen are legislators for the Nation; they are not municipal councilmen and have not the time and understanding of local metropolitan problems to permit their doing the type of job which the residents of this community deserve. I think that the time must come soon when the District of Columbia must have home rule with city officials responsible to the electorate; that they should have the opportunity to pass upon their own appropriations.

The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN] mentioned the local golf courses. I was, I think, the only member of the subcommittee who dissented from the action of the subcommittee in permitting the present operator of the golf courses within the District of Columbia to continue his operations. I believe that there is much merit to the proposition of permitting the District to operate these courses. There has been much criticism advanced against the present operator of the golf courses as the result of incompetent bookkeeping records, as the result of inadequate service rendered to the public that has been using the golf courses. The Federal Government does have a stake in these golf courses because a certain portion of the net profits derived from those golf courses is supposed to go to the Federal Government. The bookkeeping has not permitted an accurate determination of the question as to whether the profits have been fairly divided. However, in the examination that I have made I find that there have been a number of improvements that have been made over the last few years in the golf courses themselves, that the operator has taken a much stronger interest in providing facilities for the golfing public, and as a result I do not propose to offer any amendment to this bill which would permit the Government of the District of Columbia to use sufficient funds to take over the golf courses. However, I should like to point out that under the terms of the agreement between the Department of the Interior, which is the landlord, the lessor of these golf courses, and the lessee, the District of Columbia can take over the golf courses upon the

expenditure of \$275,000, and I am sure it is the intention of the committee, as brought out in the report, in the event the service to the public is not adequate or in the event the bookkeeping system of the operator is not brought up to date and not maintained in a much more accurate manner, that the District of Columbia should exercise its right under the lease and should take over the golf courses, and the Congress should provide the funds necessary to do so.

An attempt will be made here today, I am sure, to cut the Federal contribution by at least 10 percent. Under basic law the Federal Government is authorized to expend \$11,000,000 as a Federal contribution to the District of Columbia, plus 1,000,000 for the water fund for the District of Columbia. Last year that amount, under a similar authorizing statute, was cut by 10 percent. I know that as I sat and listened to the testimony that was presented to us I received the impression that in spite of the fact that the budget of the District of Columbia government has risen from \$16,000,000 in the year 1917, to \$69,000,000 in the year 1945 and then to \$136,000,000 for fiscal year 1952, like all the other great metropolitan communities throughout the country, the District of Columbia is still in very straitened circumstances. I know that the school system could stand many improvements; that there are a number of schools that ought to be built. My own son was to matriculate in one of the public schools of the District of Columbia, and in his particular grade he found that there were 55 pupils for 1 teacher. This condition is bad, not only for the children, but for the teachers as well, and it should be improved, but there are not sufficient funds.

I know this, too, that the District of Columbia has pending a pay raise for certain of its municipal employees. In the event that the Federal contribution is cut, the tax rate of the District of Columbia will have to be raised. To my mind, the city of Washington, the District of Columbia, is a Federal city. I believe if you ask every resident in this country if he would contribute less than 10 cents the amount this bill asks him to contribute to the upkeep of this Federal city that each one of them would answer in the affirmative.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. On that question of the tax rate, as I read this schedule statement C, page 23 of the record, it would indicate that the tax rate in Washington now is considerably below other cities of comparable size. Am I correct in that?

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is correct. I made that point to the assessor at the time of the hearings that real-estate taxes were lower than other cities. It is lower than other cities of comparable size, the schedule shows comparably that, but it is higher than other

cities as well. If the gentleman will examine that schedule he will find that to be true, but my point is this, if I may be permitted to finish my statement: The Federal Government is being asked at this time to pay less than 10 percent of the entire District of Columbia budget. The Federal Government receives many services and many types of help from the District of Columbia, far beyond the value of the contribution authorized. On the basis of taxable space alone, its tax bill would approximate \$18,000,000. Those seeking to reduce the amount of the Federal contribution are taking advantage of the government of the District of Columbia and the people who live in the District of Columbia, because under no stretch of the imagination can it be said that the Federal Government should not make the contribution requested in this bill.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I want to address myself to the bill on three topics. One is on the question of milk, one on fluoridation, and one on appropriations, and perhaps a word about some of the public buildings.

I had hoped to offer an amendment on page 17, line 11, after the word "milk", in this language: "except milk that meets the standards of the United States Public Health Service for grade A milk shall be accepted in the District of Columbia."

I understand that would be legislation on an appropriation bill. However, the provision on page 17 itself is legislation on an appropriation bill. I have spoken to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH,] and I know he would object to such legislation on an appropriation bill, and I would have to admit that it is legislation.

May I point out to my colleagues that the District of Columbia is the only city in the United States which has peculiar standards for milk in that it requires steam sterilization. Thirty-four of the States and more than 1,400 cities have adopted the United States Public Health Service code for grade A milk, the best milk you can get in the United States, milk just as good as that in the District of Columbia. What we have here in this area through the Maryland-Virginia milk monopoly, if you please, is a tight little organization that has prevented milk that meets the standards of the United States Public Health Service code from entering the city. Oh, it came in during the war under order from the District of Columbia, but now milk is being prevented from coming in simply because of the tight little monopoly. It has made the District of Columbia one of the lowest areas for the consumption of milk among children of all the cities of the United States. That is due to the price of milk, the monopoly of milk.

We had a bill in the District Committee last year on the question of changing this situation, but the peculiar complexion of the committee made that

change impossible. I understand there is a bill coming out of the Committee on Agriculture and I hope to put in that bill an amendment which will permit the milk that is used in 34 States and 1,400 cities as grade A milk to come into the District of Columbia and thus break this monopoly of milk that is a stranglehold on the people of the District of Columbia. The citizens of the District deserve the same privileges as those in the other States.

Out at St. Elizabeths they have the Public Health Service code for milk, but down at the city jail you cannot use it legally, you have to have milk handled with steam sterilization. It is a ridiculous situation and it ought to be changed. I am going to appeal to you later on to do that.

On the question of the fluoridation of water, I am disappointed that the committee did not see fit to put it in the bill. I understand that it, too, would be legislation on an appropriation bill. I talked to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BATES], and he was favorable to it, but it is legislation on an appropriation bill. I have asked the bill drafter to present a bill which I will introduce to the District Committee tomorrow, asking them to pass upon the question of the fluoridation of water. I think it is a step forward. It does not cost very much. It has been proven that it does stop the decay of teeth in children. It is a health measure on which we as Members of Congress ought to accept some responsibility. It is a good preventive for decay in teeth.

One question about the appropriations. I have been one Member of the House that has been standing up here asking for cuts in appropriations, but I doubt very much whether we should cut the District of Columbia appropriation bill. I say that because of the increased cost of things. The District budget has gone up year after year. I think as Members of Congress, with our people coming here from the 48 States and from the Territories, visiting here in the District of Columbia, we have a direct responsibility as to the amount of money we are to contribute as a Federal Government to the District. The Federal Government owns a tremendous amount of property and land in the District of Columbia. I doubt very much that we are carrying our proper responsibility now in the District of Columbia as it relates to the appropriation from the Congress, and I hope that the amendment that is offered to cut it 10 percent does not prevail. I have quoted for every cut that has ever been offered to an appropriation bill in the Congress, but I do not believe we should do that here. I think we have been rather stingy, if you please. As a Representative from the State of Nebraska, I am sure my people would want to make their proper contribution to the District of Columbia and make it a good clean city and one which they may well be proud to visit.

There is one other word I would like to say about some public buildings in the District of Columbia. When I was chairman of the District Committee on the public health measure I visited all of the District buildings. I must point out to the Committee on Appropriations that there are some buildings, and I am thinking now of the home for the aged and infirm, which is a fire hazard. This Congress has a responsibility in that connection. I realize since we visited that place that a water system to handle fire hazards has been installed, but there are a number of buildings that are old and in need of repair. Here again the Members of Congress have a definite responsibility to see that those public buildings are in the shape that they can meet the needs of the population of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday in Providence, R. I., Providence College held its annual commencement exercises. My colleague, AIME FORAND, who is now serving his thirteenth year as a Member of the Congress from the First Congressional District of the State of Rhode Island, was honored by Providence College yesterday afternoon when they conferred on him the degree of doctor of laws. AIME FORAND has had a long and distinguished career in public office in the State of Rhode Island, having served for many years as a member of the house of representatives in Providence and then coming here as a secretary to two of our most illustrious Members of Congress and then taking the place of one of those Members in 1936. Because of the outstanding service that he has rendered to the people of the State of Rhode Island, Providence College conferred on him yesterday afternoon a well-deserved honor by conferring on him the degree of doctor of laws, and he is now known as Dr. AIME JOSEPH FORAND.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I see no reason to try to amend this bill with so few Members on the floor. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BATES of Kentucky and Mr. STOCKMAN.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 41, noes 1.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. MCCORMACK having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4329, the District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1952, had come to no resolution thereon.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING BILL

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therewith extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a letter from Senator Jack B. Tenney, of the State Legislature of California. He has for many years been head of the un-American activities committee of our legislature. He has sent me a copy of a letter addressed to the gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS]. He has mailed a similar copy to other Members of the House, pointing out the dangers of dual control and dual power of the technique of communism that he sees in the present universal military training bill which will be considered under the conference report tomorrow.

His letter is as follows:

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE,
SENATE,
June 3, 1951.

Hon. PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Congressman, Twelfth California District, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR PAT: Interested citizens and organizations in Los Angeles County and throughout the State have contacted me in reference to the universal military training bill which, I understand, is to come before the House this week for concurrence in free conference amendments. I have not had an opportunity to see the bill as now amended, but I am familiar with S. 1 which replaced the House bill by amendment. Likewise, I do not know what the free conference amendments are and therefore am unable to evaluate the proposal as it appears in its final form. Regardless of the amendments, it appears that the basic provisions of the act are retained and that the objections heretofore raised are therefore still valid and worthy of consideration.

Objections to this type of legislation are extremely difficult to present in view of the fact that understandable arguments go more to the background than to the legislation itself and must, consequently, be coupled

with material that, at first glance, appears extraneous.

At the out-set, you should understand that there is no objection whatsoever to the idea of universal military training per se. This proposal has long been advocated by the American Legion and other patriotic organizations and has generally enjoyed the full support of the people. As a Legionnaire, I have consistently supported the general idea and still do. My first concern with the pending bill is the result of a statement by National Commander Erie Cocke, Jr., before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, January 22, 1951. At that time (see p. 702, Hearings by Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services), Commander Cocke made the following statement: "We want to make it clear that the plan before you is not universal military training of the type so long advocated by the American Legion and supported by the people." (S. 1 was later amended into the House bill.)

In order to understand the objections now being raised against the final passage of this legislation, the following background must be carefully considered. (It is fully documented and I am sure that you can secure documentation through the Library of Congress.)

The successful overthrow of the Kerenski government in the 1917 Bolshevik revolution in Russia was chiefly predicated on Lenin's concept of dual power. This idea was successfully applied by the Bolsheviks under Lenin's direction by utilizing the soldiers and sailors soviets (committees). Upon his return from exile in Finland, Lenin raised the slogan "All power to the Soviets." Alongside the Kerenski government the soviets of workers, soldiers, and sailors deputies assumed and exercised governmental powers so that the dissolution of the Russian Constituent Assembly at Lenin's and Trotsky's order became a mere detail and was accomplished without firing a shot.

Dimitrov, at the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern in Moscow in 1935, enunciated the Trojan-horse policy which embodied in concrete language the dual-power concept. From 1935 onward this strategy of the Trojan horse-dual power idea has controlled the thinking of the top brass in the Communist Party of the United States. The general strategy has slopped over into the thinking and techniques of radical left-wing Socialists and undoubtedly dominates inner-circle directives.

Earl Browder, reporting to the national executive committee of the Communist Party in 1944 emphasizes the dual-power concept in considerable detail (see the Communist for March 1944). You are undoubtedly familiar with the paper by Hitler's last chief of staff, Gen. Heinz Guderian, written in an American prison camp at the specific direction of top American staff officers. I understand that the Guderian study was made after the enactment of the armed services unification law. Congressman WERDEL, in my opinion, has done a magnificent public service in bringing this matter to public attention. It seems to me that the questions asked by Tom WERDEL should be satisfactorily answered before the final passage of the present UMT bill. Heinz Guderian himself stated that he made the study "at the request of the Historical Division of the United States Army." As far as I have been able to ascertain, no one has answered WERDEL's question as to why the request was made.

The Guderian plan may be said to outline a military high command, completely in the Prussian general staff mold, advocating a

thorough military dictatorship in time of war—and in peace as far as civilian problems effect the military. The plan, as you probably very well know, details the organization of a nation under military dictatorship so that its people, its economy, its politics, and its thinking, may be effectively directed and controlled by the high command. It appears to many (and it so appears to me) that the essence of the Guderian recommendations is included in the pending UMT bill.

The present bill on which you will be called upon to vote sometime this week appears to fit in with the foregoing in the following respects: Total conscription (S. 1, 82d Cong, subsec. A, sec. 4); total censorship and control of the press; forced labor, et cetera. In view of the fact that Congress appears to have lost the constitutional right to declare war and to determine whether or not the Armed Forces of the Nation are to be sent to the four corners of the world, it would seem that subsection D, paragraph 2 of section 6 effectively bypasses the chain of command placing full power in the Secretary of Defense rather than in the President of the United States as the supreme commander of the Armed Forces of the country.

It seems to me that the provision of the bill providing that the legislation go into effect some time in the future, together with the general provision that the foregoing points apply to peacetime, should give our Representatives in Congress ground for pause and further study.

Finally, your attention is called to article 7 of the United Nations Charter. The application of the provisions of this article to the pending UMT bill should become significant and should not be dismissed without a good look at the records and philosophy of the individuals who may be empowered to administer the act.

The original UMT proposal contemplated a period of military training for the youth of the Nation for the specific purpose of permanent military reserves to be called upon in time of war or emergency. This is the idea sponsored by the American Legion and patriotic organizations throughout the Nation. It was never contemplated that such legislation should embody a dual-power concept which might bypass both the President and Congress for the purpose of establishing a socialistic military dictatorship in time of peace.

There is much more that I would like to say to you on this subject but I believe the foregoing will indicate to you the general scope of objections. Many people who have given sincere study to the problem find a terrifying analogy in Lenin's dual-power concept and the present proposal. Lack of confidence in Truman, Acheson, Marshal, et al., is apparently basic in the minds of most people and this same lack of confidence undoubtedly contributes considerably to fear and suspicion of the UMT bill as now written. Regardless of the cause, it appears to me that the foregoing factors are worthy of consideration and study. Congress should see to it that the military remains under complete civilian control; that the constitutional powers of the President and the Congress be in no wise weakened and that the letter and the spirit of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights be fully preserved and maintained for the people of the United States in time of peace.

Very sincerely,

JACK B. TENNEY.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri asked and was granted permission to address the House tomorrow, June 7, 1951, for 15

minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

LOCAL AUTONOMY IN UNIONS

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, we meet in a beautiful Chamber recently remodeled within stone walls. We anticipate its perpetual use. We have installed two beautiful clocks so that we may tell each expiring instant of the march of time, but those clocks also mark off the remaining time until corruption at home or violence from abroad will penetrate these stone walls and adjourn this council of freemen permanently.

As their counsel we must pass laws for freemen to live by. They cannot live free by executive directive. The battle cry of Boston was "No taxation without representation." The same cry is heard today, expressed in the words "No more government by executive decree." Our Chief Executive should realize that Americans admit temporal subservience to no mortal man whether he be military leader, religious leader, labor leader, president of a business trust, or President of the United States. It is understandable that most of us are deeply concerned with respect to our dangers from abroad. However, too few of us are concerned with our disorders here at home. Domestic disorders magnify the threat from abroad and domestic disorders give hope and encouragement to our plundering foreign enemy. It has been well said that we are in danger "not so much by our enemies' power as by our own neglect." It is not so much the potency of our enemies as the weakness of ourselves that threatens us.

In regard to domestic weaknesses, a large segment of our people are losing confidence in their Government; the Congress has delegated its powers to be exercised by nonelected officials; the Executive has surrounded himself with incompetent and corrupt advisers and cannot get good advice to perform our delegated duties; we have locked up some traitors but further investigation is thwarted by Executive orders which protect the big brain who is yet unknown; their per-capita portion of our national debt now exceeds the total assessed valuation of some counties; with each session of Congress we further oppress and depress our citizens; we are exhausting our natural resources to buy disrespect abroad; we have closed down our strategic metals industry; we now say we will either expand the national debt or apply ruinous taxation; we are destroying Christian self-reliance by political bribery programs; we pay tribute to foreigners in an effort to buy their friendship; we allow leaders of enslaved groups to destroy law and order if they can turn over some votes; a segment of our free press is more interested in building its circulation than it is in presenting our true domestic and foreign condition to the American people; many so-called leaders of the minority party refuse to

do their duty and draw the issues against corruption for the guaranteed bloodless revolution of the election day.

Mr. Speaker, all civilizations have discovered that changing economic and social conditions create new equitable rights, the recognition of which is demanded by the governed from their government. When those rights were not recognized, governments have always been overthrown from within by some leader offering to the have-nots what the haves have. There would have been no Napoleon if he had not bribed the poor against the rich. He bribed Catholic Ireland against Protestant England; Protestant Switzerland against Catholic Europe. He bribed the Mussulman of North Africa against all Christendom. Napoleon set up a new system of banking in order to redistribute the accumulated wealth for political purposes. He defined new minority groups, told them what their troubles were and advised them to come to Napoleon to find relief.

It is more than coincidence that people rising in revolt to define new equitable rights have never experimented with free government except that area of the world which lives by the Old and New Testament. We here in this body are under oath of office to define new equitable rights into laws so that they may be enforced by poor men in local courts. However, we stumble on today through public lies and self-deception. We appear to have lost our virtue and public morals. Under such circumstances, liberty is, of course, the greatest of all evils because it is folly, vice, and madness without instruction or restraint. These and others, Mr. Speaker, are listed as assets at the Kremlin which they may subtract in order to determine their necessary military strength.

It is, therefore, little wonder what our Communists at home and their social planning running-mates are so bold. They know that Russia need move no Russian armies into the field against us. We need no foes abroad—just the ticking of our beautiful clocks will ruin us.

Our ship of state is checked and turned willy-nilly in its course. Its skipper who received his papers by using our delegated powers in political bribery and chicanery is perplexed by the results of his own follies.

Even though there are some follies which baffle argument, which go beyond ridicule and which excite no feeling in me but disgust, I have just introduced a bill by which I hope to correct one of those follies. In the past, this administration and its predecessors provided the means whereby a handful of individuals gained autocratic power over the welfare and livelihood of 16,000,000 American families. This administration now lives in fear of those autocrats and their power. These autocrats get a special dispensation from this administration if they agree to turn over the vote through a controlled labor press. In return for publishing falsehoods, half-truths, and slanted news releases in their controlled press and for forcing work-

ingmen and their families to contribute to the administration's campaign fund or lose their jobs, these autocrats have been given powers by this administration and its predecessor which now threatens to destroy our country. The dispensations they receive places them above and beyond the law. They are in fact trustees over the welfare and earning power of 16,000,000 families with additional power to affect the national security and the welfare of all of the other families of America, most of whom are workingmen. These politically anointed so-called labor leaders purporting to speak for all workingmen are in Washington spending large sums of money to enforce a socialist labor policy which they claim to be a peoples' mandate. Like other autocrats, they are puffed up with personal pride and arrogance and despise Government regulations that limit their activities and place responsibility on them.

By Executive Order 10233 issued April 21, 1951, the President of the United States has again capitulated to these autocrats. Contrary to the expressed will of this Congress, the President, by Executive decree, has granted powers to the Wage Stabilization Board to completely destroy the rights of individual workingmen and their families as established under the Labor-Management Relations Act. The American public is demanding to know why these Executive decrees have been made. The autocrats are silent. They rely completely upon their claim to have turned over the vote in the past and their promise to do it and collect campaign funds in the future. At the present time, the administration is expressing itself before the Labor Committee of this House. Its expressed reasons are nothing more than platitudes expressed to support these autocrats who have power over men and their families who in turn enjoy no secret ballot in their election.

As citizens of the United States, we must admit that the Wagner Act which gave unions protection and the right to organize were laws placed on the statute books as the result of public opinion. The American public also knew for many years prior to 1947 that the Wagner Act had to be amended to provide the foundation for industrial peace. Unreasonable labor leadership had to be controlled because there were many labor abuses as well as racketeering. Organized labor lost many friends because their leaders would not admit that their power like that of all other leaders and trustees could not be arbitrary. In other words, public opinion was again demanding in 1947 a change in behalf of the public interest. Management no longer had sufficient authority over its employees to do a good job of managing. Investors were fearful of making investments. Many businessmen were considering closing their shops to avoid radical leadership. Places of employment were closed while a branch of one union fought another branch of the same union or had jurisdictional disputes with a different union. So far as the

Wagner Act was concerned, the public was apparently expected to wait until one union licked the other and if at the end of that time, the employer was still in business he was to accept blame for all of the difficulties and commence production as usual.

Under the Wagner Act, the American public was disgusted. Some of our labor leaders who never had to carry a traditional and secret ballot election of their unions had the power to shut off the coal or steel supply, turn off the lights and stop our shipping and communications. These labor leaders boldly claimed that labor was above the law, that organized labor held special privileges above and beyond the needs of the rest of the people even when those people were speaking through their Government, the United States of America.

Remember back in May of 1946, when President Truman made a hysterical call to Congress for power to draft the striking railroad employees into the Army. The memory of that incident is still fresh in the minds of all of us. We must make sure that neither President Truman or anyone else will ever have the power to force men to work against their will. It behooves us today to also remember that President Truman's request in May of 1946 came the year following the report that a bill had been drafted at the Pentagon to draft all men into military service to work in our industries.

Farmers all over the country were seriously worried because they had lost thousands of tons of food stuffs due to the fact that a union would not deliver their products and would not unload their products without high special fees paid to these new autocrats. These are un-American activities and the public demanded a curb on them.

Congress met in 1947 and through its Senate and House Labor Committees, meeting for several months, gave everyone an opportunity to be heard. That Congress made a great step forward in the American industrial economy by passing the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 in which it took the first step after many years under the Wagner Act to define and protect four classes of rights based upon American industrial experience. Those classes of rights were as follows: the individual worker, the union, the management, and the public.

It is fundamental that any statutory law meet the test of time as to whether or not it is beneficial to the public interest and that it will be amended when it has been demonstrated to the legislature that it is not for the public interest either in total or in part. It is also fundamental that whenever new equitable rights are demonstrated to have come into existence under statutory law, that law must be amended in order to define those rights in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, we in America must recall for our own benefit and for the benefit of the next generation that this country was conceived as a poor-man's country and was criticized as such. The critics were of the frame of mind that

you could not turn the control of the Government over to the working classes and still protect that Government from the passions of the governed. It was said that "It is ordained in the eternal constitution of things that men of intemperate minds cannot be free. That their very passions forge the chains to rebind them." The framers of our Constitution replied that American people of all classes would forever cherish the right to compete in accordance with their individual relative excellence.

It is, therefore, incumbent upon the American people and this Congress to protect the rights of the individual workingman that I have just mentioned as being defined in the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. That is our duty if we are to require of him, as we must, his obligation to defend the American way of life. We must insure his right to bargain collectively in this industrial age. However, we must insist that he have the opportunity for his benefit and for national security to control his labor leaders and his union which now carry great power; 175 years of experience under our form of government demonstrates that he will act reasonably if he is given the right.

Mr. Speaker, on April 3 of this year I made a documented speech under a special order of this House. I believe that I demonstrated the intention of this administration to control its frankensteins through military socialism because in its opinion the American people are no longer fit to be free. This administration assumes that the American people will accept military socialism in time of war emergency. His acts indicate that our President intends to assume complete Executive control of our economy, our press, foreign policy, including the drafting of labor, under newly discovered inherent powers of the President in war emergencies. Yet his appointees and attorneys are talking about his inherent powers at the present time resulting from the war emergency when the Congress has not declared war. I submit to you that he believes the American people will accept those tactics as the only means left to control a handful of men who boldly threaten to destroy our war-making potential for their own personal power and gain.

The pay-offs by this administration to their frankensteins have been astounding. In spite of the antitrust laws, the executive departments of our Government aided its frankensteins in establishing the policy of bargaining across whole industries in labor relations. That policy is now being used in over 20 unions, including coal, iron, automobiles, electrical appliances, household appliances, shoes, clothing, steel, and many others. Such bargaining is not against the employer but is against the American consumer, 90 percent of whom are other workingmen, aged people, and farmers.

Mr. Speaker, last year this administration supported a bill to make it a crime for an employer to pay less than 75 cents an hour even though he could not afford to do so as a minimum wage.

At that time the administration said that 12,000,000 people would be benefited and that they should receive at least \$1 an hour. I want to point out recent political demagoguery of this administration in appealing to the workingmen; by Executive order it has now made it a crime for an employer to pay more than 75 cents per hour. It did this after it acted in collusion with its labor Frankensteins to put a wage differential in a workingman's car of about \$400 and comparable wage differentials in shoes, clothing, and household appliances. It did it after it froze those wage differentials into the necessities of life of other workingmen for a period that it estimates to be at least 10 years. It now says it will allow cost-of-living escalator clauses as political bribery to keep the labor demagogs in control of their unions so that they can turn over the vote and make campaign collections.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in this industrial age that workingmen should have the right to bargain collectively with their particular employer. However, a growing number of our people today believe that organized labor should be outlawed because it is threatening the security of the United States and our form of Government. I do not believe that to be true, if this Congress will perform its duty to define equitable rights in this industrial age into laws that can be enforced by poor men in local courts. Labor leaders are in fact voluntary trustees. Their responsibilities and duties must be defined. Their beneficiaries are the workingmen and their wives who the trustees purport to represent. The general public must also be protected in connection with their activities. Certainly we cannot condemn the right to bargain collectively in the national interest unless we first give the beneficiaries of those trustees the right of a truly secret ballot in their election. We must also give those beneficiaries the right of a truly secret ballot on the issue of whether or not a strike should be called against the employer. At the present time these autocrats hold the power to determine who should stay in business as employers and manufacturers and who should go out. They have the power by bargaining across industries to create new marginal producers. We must give unions local autonomy. The only alternative to this action is that the labor movement will destroy itself as it did in England and in Germany where the workingman found that it makes little difference whether a demagog springs first from the left or the right.

Mr. Speaker, the bill that I introduced does the following things:

Although the strike ballot provisions and the provisions respecting the election of union officers are separate, the bill has one single broad objective, for example, insuring to rank-and-file employees freedom of choice in deciding whether or not they should go out on strike and what men they shall select for union office. Consequently, the bill may be aptly cited, as section 1 provides, as the "Democracy in Union Act, 1951."

Sections 2, 3, and 4 of the act create a system under which the exercise of the right to strike is conditioned upon the use of the facilities of the National Labor Relations Board and the taking of a secret ballot. As a result of the invalidation of the Bonin-Tripp Act—Michigan antistrike law—by the United States Supreme Court, it is no longer possible for States to pass statutes requiring strike votes in industries which are subject to the Taft-Hartley Act. The Taft-Hartley Act itself contains no provisions for strike votes except to the extent to which the Conciliation Service and the parties resort to such a device. The only mandatory provision in the Federal law with respect to strike ballots occurs in the national emergency provisions of title II in which the conduct of such a referendum by the Labor Board is the last step preceding the vacation of the injunction.

Under section 3 (b) of my bill, no strike is legal unless the labor organization which proposed to call it serves a 45-day notice upon the National Labor Relations Board as well as upon the employer. The 45-day notice should not impose an undue hardship upon labor unions as they are now required to serve a similar 60-day notice under section 8 (d) of the Taft-Hartley Act upon their employer if they propose to invoke the termination clause or reopening clause of an existing agreement. The Taft-Hartley Act, however, does not provide for any such notice where there is no contract in existence, whereas my bill would require a 45-day notice, both upon the Board and the employer, irrespective of contract. During the period the 45-day notice is in effect, presumably the parties would seek to adjust their differences by collective bargaining and by resort to the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. After the 45-day period has expired, if the notice is still pending, the NLRB must then take a secret ballot during the succeeding 15 days on the question of whether or not the employees are willing to accept the final offer of settlement made by the employer.

Section 3 (c) of my bill provides that such balloting shall be conducted by mail. Presumably the Board would make regulations comparable to those relating to the casting of absentee ballots under State law so that the envelope containing the ballot would bear on it the signature of the employees. Observers may be present at the actual tally of the ballots but presumably the identity of the voter would not be revealed to the observers. Of course, during the period in which the ballot is pending, both unions and employers may address arguments to the voters. It was not considered necessary to put such a clause in the bill, for the right of free speech in labor disputes is already assured by section 8 (c) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

One of the purposes of the secret ballot provided in section 3 (c) through using mail facilities is to permit such ballots to be taken out of the influence of mob psychology. It is designed to allow a man and his wife to discuss the probable effects of a strike in connection with their own welfare. It will thus give a housewife an opportunity to advise in

connection with periodic interference in the family income. I believe the time has come when the Congress must admit that the American housewife is entitled to at least an opportunity to advise with her husband in connection with such matters. My bill also provides that not more than one of these strike referenda should be conducted in the same bargaining union in any one year.

Section 4 provides that a strike may be conducted only if a majority of the employees eligible to vote reject the final offer of settlement. Unless the Labor Board certifies this fact, it becomes a criminal offense to instigate strikes or to encourage them directly or indirectly by picketing or paying strike benefits.

Section 5 deals with elections for union office. It provides that no officer of a labor organization may continue to hold office unless there is an opportunity for a free election every 2 years under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor. Unions violating this section lose their right to represent employees under the terms of the National Labor Relations Act and may not file any petition or charges with the Board. In general, the provisions of this section, except for a minor modification in subsection (c), were taken verbatim from H. R. 418, now pending in the House Labor Committee. In the event the provisions of my bill cause a vacancy to exist in labor leadership necessary to protect the rights of union membership, my bill also provides that the local courts shall have jurisdiction to appoint a trustee to fill that vacancy until a union election has been held.

Section 6 contains definitions of terms which are used in the preceding subsections.

Section 7 exempts disputes subject to the provisions of the Railway Labor Act from the provisions of the proposed bill.

Section 8 contains the conventional provisions with respect to the rights of individual employees.

Mr. Speaker, I believe early action on my bill is an urgent necessity. If we are to avoid military socialism, we must guarantee local autonomy in unions and we must place responsibility for law enforcement in this subject at the local level. If we do that, we can again rely upon the patriotism of our people to see that law and order is enforced in the local area through their local courts and police officers. We must destroy the powers held by irresponsible individuals to force our people on the trail to socialism.

Surely it is now clear to everyone that our demagogic administration will not take action against these Frankensteins created by itself for political purposes. It offers the American people only a fear program in foreign affairs and it is presently creating the situation whereby it will offer the American people military socialism as the only solution for domestic corruption.

The answer is clear, Mr. Speaker, the arrogance and boldness of the bureaucratic Cossacks riding through the halls of this Congress as the creatures of this administration are now inflicting fear into the administration itself. We in this Congress must have the courage to

act as the representatives of our people or all is lost. The real reason back of the President's Executive order on last April 21 creating new dispute powers in the Wage Stabilization Board is that these bold, arrogant, nonelected, selfish, political and self-serving labor bosses know that they cannot exact their tribute from their workingmen if they live by the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. If they live by that act the American patriot as a union member is able to control their action. The President created these new powers in the Wage Stabilization Board so that he could point to its recommendations in granting new concessions to these autocrats at the expense of all of the families in America, to justify his cowardly action of capitulation.

There is always a mandate of the people to improve a workingman's condition in our country. There is never a mandate to create dual government or to create government within government which must be controlled by military socialism. It makes no difference whether we first view new kings and emperors approaching from the left or the right. We do not want them. There is never a mandate in republican government or in proper union structure to turn the clock back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. KING]. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. KEARNS (at the request of Mr. LUCAS) for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

To Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for June 6, on account of death in family.

To Mr. MORANO (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for June 6, 1951, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances, in two to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRIEST asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by the Speaker of the House to the graduating class of the University of Texas.

Mr. HEFFERNAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article, and also to include an address by Rear Admiral Lamont Pugh, delivered at the graduation exercises of the nurses' training school of the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn, N. Y., on May 14, 1951.

Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a brief prepared by the Honorable CARL D. PERKINS and presented before the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. RAINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a brief entitled "Advertising and the American Economy," by Mr. Carmage Walls, of Gadsden, Ala.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two

instances, in one to include a letter from a constituent, Mr. Leo Lynch, of Clarion, Iowa, in regard to the ceiling on cattle prices, and in the other a radio address by Prof. R. M. Bliss, formerly director of extension for Iowa State College entitled "Inflation and the Beef Cattle Price Roll-back."

Mr. VAN PELT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix.

Mr. AYRES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a very thoughtful editorial from the Boston Post.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances.

Mr. DEWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a quotation.

Mrs. HARDEN asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Farm Journal.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a transcript of the Golden Jubilee of the Jewish National Fund, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the Record and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$512.50.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article appearing in the New Yorker magazine on May 26.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include editorials.

Mr. MCKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial which appeared in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in three instances.

Mr. SHELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in two instances, in each to include an editorial.

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILLINGS and Mr. BENDER asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROBERTS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include editorials appearing in the Anniston Star.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGLE (at the request of Mr. YORTY) was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix.

Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include three letters.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 5, 1951, present to the President, for his approval, a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1612. An act to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of

1930, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 253. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from the foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Japanese Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 7, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 541. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 4345. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for unpaid compulsory labor and inhumane treatment of prisoners of war and for other enemy violations of the Geneva Convention respecting prisoners of war; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 4346. A bill to authorize the construction of certain flood-control improvements on the Calumet Union drainage ditch in the vicinity of Harvey, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WERDEL:

H. R. 4347. A bill to grant employees an opportunity to express themselves, free from restraint and coercion, with respect to interruptions of production and on their choice of officers of labor organizations representing them in industries affecting commerce; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 4363. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Indian Claims Commission to hear and determine the claims of the Pottawatomie Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. Res. 243. Resolution to preserve the American system of free enterprise and to lower the cost of living by encouraging price wars in retail prices of food and other necessities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. Res. 244. Resolution to investigate irregular and unfair price fixing against the public interest; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Res. 245. Resolution to provide for the integrity and freedom of Formosa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 246. Resolution to provide for the integrity and freedom of Formosa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. Res. 247. Resolution to provide for the integrity and freedom of Formosa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HALE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, making application to the Congress of the United States for the calling of a convention to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine rescinding proposal for considering a Constitutional Convention of the United States or amendments to the Constitution of the United States relating to strengthening the United Nations and Limited World Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4348. A bill for the relief of Jozef Dryja Vel Bienkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4349. A bill for the relief of Alojzy Nieckarz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4350. A bill for the relief of Albert Goldman, postmaster at New York, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4351. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Ursula Rutherford Ollinger; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4352. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mary Rutherford Spearson; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 4353. A bill for the relief of Col. Arthur L. Shreve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 4354. A bill for the relief of Boutros Mouallem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 4355. A bill for the relief of Georgia Christos Demarelos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 4356. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yau Shun Leung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 4357. A bill for the relief of Aaron Weiner and Moses Beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4358. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vincenzo Guzzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 4359. A bill for the relief of the estate of Lloyd L. Warfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4360. A bill for the relief of W. P. Sweetman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAIL:

H. R. 4361. A bill for the relief of Chana Singer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H. R. 4362. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine,

and render judgment upon a certain claim of Damaso P. Perez, and Mercedes Ruth Cobb Perez, his wife, their heirs, administrators, or assigns against the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 7, 1951

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 17, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we come praying that Thou wilt refresh our souls and restore our faith as in all the bewilderment of the world's fiery strife our burdened hearts seek the quiet sanctuary of Thy healing presence. We are grateful that again we can turn unfilled to Thee with the tender grace of a new morning, fresh with the sparkling dew of Thy never-failing mercies. Thou hast called us to play our part in a day of destiny and crisis. May we not be found wanting. Forgetting the unworthy things that are behind and stretching forth to the better things that are before, as in hours of vision we see a fairer earth, let us lay aside the weight of every prejudice and the covetous sins that do so easily beset us, and regarding our high privilege as a sacred trust march on with glad and eager feet with the armies that go to free, not to bind, to develop and not to rule, to cooperate and not to dominate, until the knowledge of the Lord, who is no respecter of persons, shall cover the earth as the waters now cover the sea. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 5, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that Mr. HAYS of Arkansas had been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India, vice Mr. CARNAHAN, of Missouri, excused.

The message announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 52. An act for the relief of Delfo Giorgi; S. 53. An act for the relief of Vittorio Quilici;

S. 155. An act for the relief of Victor G. Lutfalla;

S. 223. An act for the relief of Azy Ajderian;

S. 276. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander V. Papanicolaou and his wife, Emilia;

S. 277. An act for the relief of Lily Pfannenschmidt;

S. 291. An act for the relief of Claudio Pier Connelly;

S. 297. An act for the relief of Tsung Hsien Hsu;

S. 348. An act for the relief of Jacoba van Dorp;

S. 356. An act for the relief of Edith Winifred Henderson;

S. 363. An act for the relief of Irmgard Kohler;

S. 463. An act for the relief of Alice de Bony de Lavergne;

S. 548. An act for the relief of Freidoun Jalayer; and

S. 1092. An act for the relief of Dr. Francesco Drago.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 178. An act for the relief of Zdenek Marek;

S. 249. An act for the relief of Ruzena Pelantova;

S. 361. An act for the relief of Herk Visnapuu and his wife, Naima;

S. 362. An act for the relief of Tu Do Chau (also known as Szetu Dju or Anna Szetu);

S. 364. An act for the relief of Mrs. Suzanne Wiernik and her daughter, Genevieve; and

S. 648. An act for the relief of Evald Ferdinand Kask.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33) authorizing certain changes in the enrollment of Senate bill 435, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 598. An act for the relief of Sonja Lohmann and her minor son;

H. R. 662. An act for the relief of William O. Stevens;

H. R. 702. An act for the relief of Karl Chimani and Ada Chimani;

H. R. 732. An act for the relief of Konstantios N. Bellos;

H. R. 740. An act for the relief of John Reginald Leat;

H. R. 748. An act for the relief of Basil Vasso Argyris and Mrs. Aline Argyris;

H. R. 1096. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gizella Keady-Reich;